THE
CHOWKHAMBA SANSKRIT SERIES

STUDIES Vol. III.

# YUGANADDHA

## THE TANTRIC VIEW OF LIFE

BY

HERBERT. V. GUENTHER. PH. D.

BANARAS
THE CHOWKHAMBA SANSKRIT SERIES OFFICE
1952

YUGANADDHA (CHOW. SANS. STUDIES. VOL. III) RS. 8-0

THE

CHOWKHAMBA SANSKRIT SERIES

*Studies Vol. III*

# YUGANADDHA

## The Tantric View of Life

*BY*

HERBERT V. GUENTHER, PH. D.

Published by
The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office,
P. O. Box 8, Banaras 1.

*All Rights Reserved by the Publishers*

1952

Printed by
Pt. Rameshwar Pathak,
At The Tara Printing Works,
BANARAS.

# PREFACE

> "Das Unbeschreibliche:
> Hier ist's getan-
> Das Ewig-Weibliche
> *Zieht* uns hinan."
> (Goethe, Faust II)

I can foresee that two types of persons will hasten to read this book: the scholar and the Philistine; then, as each of them tells about it to his own in his particular way, others will take it up—the artist, the philologist, the spiritualist and the *arbiter elegantiarum*. It has its special appeal to all of them. Yet I believe that it addresses itself preeminently to the scholar who tops this list. There is one struggle going on among the intelligent, the struggle between the votaries of inspiration and the votaries of information. From the academic point of view, the latter must be given the prize; from all other viewpoints, the former deserve the laurel. This volume, however, earns the twofold praise: it inspires as it informs, and this twinship is the criterion of true craftsmanship.

The topics handled in this book are difficult as they are delicate, and their appreciation presumes a subtle, balanced and unbiassed mind. Even before this book is out those who are aware of its subject as well as of the chequered pattern of its prospective readers know that there will be at least as much indignation as there will be praise and understanding. No doubt, the Western trained intellect will own it as a piece of long desired instruction; so will the pious Eastern mind without such training unless it is tinged with that peculiar bias that has been estranging the two from one another for about a century. What is this noxious bias that stands in the way of any achievement in a humanist world ? It is a complex set of notions resulting from prudery and puritanism, which in India at least, are the sorry bequest of the worst side of Western civilization ; there, however, the Victorian age is bygone and its dicta have remained but as an inexhaustible source of such worthy institutions as the Punch and kindred literature ; as such, they are indeed precious and laudable, but if perpetually applied to the life in the twentieth century or, what is worse, foisted ingenuously on as the purport of the Scriptures, they are detrimental. This, however, is what is being done even in learned circles ; why, the very greatest names in the recent history of our country and its culture share the burden of this error.

I have noticed with amazement what the doubtlessly most intelligent even keep saying and thinking about works of unmatched beauty and wisdom created in this country ; the lovely sculptures, frescos, and paintings adorning our oldest shrines and telling of a wonderfully passionate love of life, are being despised as though they were profane, and pious ear-lobes are pulled in shocked defiance at their very mention ; the best canto of the Bhagavata-Purana is being explained away as a mere metaphor, the sweet tales of the holy wooing of Uma for Her Lord and their consummation, as pedestrian symbolisms. I believe that in this respect at least the zealous missionary who has been working doggedly since Vasco disembarked has been entirely successful. The morbid appeal to the otherwise-ever-so-helpless to crucify his flesh with its desires has run home ; it could do so, because *adhikārabheda* had been enforced on the wrong side only-in social matters, that is. But the fact that asceticism is good for a tiny fraction of aspirants to the Spirit only and useless as well as disastrous to the average seeker had been forgotten, perhaps even deliberately concealed, by certain interested circles.

Tantrik Philosophy, or rather Psychology, has tried to do away with these notions that are not genuine to Indian Thought but it has failed in the attempt; it is not usually appreciated as on an equal rank with the other *darshanas*, and very often it is simply hushed away with the same sentiment that frowns at the architecture of Konarak and at literal interpretations of Jayadeva's grand piece.

In the Kaula and other schools of Tantra, the deity is invoked as *bhukti-mukti-pradāyinī*; and the first two elements in this composite stand in the *dvandva-relation*. She gives first *bhukti*, then *mukti* in due time; or, if you take it in the advaitic sense, she gives them all at once in that *bhukti* and *mukti* are one, and it is only the *sādhana* that has to account for this juxtaposition; this however, has to be taught by the preceptor and he who stands outside this *sādhana* is not entitled to pass a verdict on it. Tantra is essentially a *sādhana-shāstra*; and "yuganaddha" is its implication.

Sir John Woodroff has done the best he could at his time to bring the esoteric teaching of the Hindu Tantra to the notice of the scholarly world. But he did not know Sanskrit himself—or not much of it. He did not know Pali, and neither he nor his pundit-friends knew any Tibetan. Now Tantra was left to be elaborated in a poorer, less sophisticated, but readier region; on the cold heights of the Tibetan plateau, the system found its own. Today, we cannot have a true picture of Tantric Thought without a thorough knowledge of Tibetan along with Sanskrit. So it was up to Dr. Guenther, the young savant of breath-taking versatility, to tackle this problem. Dr. Guenther is not only a philologist who masters the involved languages along with the linguistic method and a formidable number of other languages ancient and modern, but he is also and perhaps mainly, a psychologist. And what is more, he is a convinced Buddhist himself. The engineer who can well drive the cars he builds is likely to be a better engineer than the one who cannot. When the illustrious Ceylonese monk-artist Manjushri Thero initiated Dr. Guenther into the Sangha some five years ago at Vienna, Austria (to which impressive ceremony I had luckily been invited as a non-too-impartial observer), he was given the name "Vighnantaka," vanquisher of obstacles. I trust he will always be up to his name. In this book, for a beginning, he has certainly been. And if, as one belonging to a somewhat antagonistically orientated Order, I have any good-wishes or even blessings to give, they are most definitely with Dr. Guenther and his book.

Banaras Hindu University, SWAMI AGEHANANDA
*Banaras, 26th August 1952.*

# INTRODUCTION.

The Tantras—there is hardly any other kind of literature that has met with so much abuse, particularly by those who never read or seriously studied a single line of it; or that has so much fascinated those who on the testimony of misinformed and uninformed people thought the Tantras to be a most powerful, and hence strictly guarded means for the gratification of purely biological urges. Only very few people tried to form an opinion of the Tantras by their own. It is true the Tantras are nothing for those who are so pure in mind and, alas! so poor-minded that they are unable to see that actual life is different from the fantastic and mutually contradictory theories and ideas they have about it; nor are the Tantras meant for those who consider life to be nothing else but a *chronique scandaleuse*. But since it is easier to follow extremes than to weigh the evidence and to decide upon a middle path, there can be no doubt that these extremists have done great harm to the study and understanding of what the Tantras have to tell. For it is by their verdict —unjustified abuse based upon wilful ignorance and misconceptions about the aim of the Tantras engendered by this ignorance—that the Tantras are nowadays held in contempt and considered to be something depraved and mean. Yet the fact is that the Tantras contain a very sound and healthy view of life. But just as it is impossible to understand the function of the kidney, for instance, without regarding its place in the whole of the living organism, so also the Tantras cannot be understood without taking into account the rich display of human life.

First of all, the Tantras are not a philosophy. They are an experience of life, of life just as it is, and in this way they are the basic foundation of many a philosophy that has developed at a later stage. Moreover, philosophy, understood in the sense of the present day and not in the sense of its etymology, stresses only one side of human life, the intellectual side particularly, and by overstressing it philosophy easily explodes in torrents of learned scurrility against the alleged enemies of what the particular brand of ideology stands for. Philosophies of late have tended more to consumate the work of self-destruction and of the annihilation of human values than to enrich human life, because all of them lack the sustaining emotional warmth of feeling and participation. It is therefore no exaggeration to say that the Tantras come as the necessary corrective for the one-sidedness of philosophical reasoning which either views man from and in the drab garb of materialism or looks at him through the tainted glass of an equally insipid, romantic-sentimentalistic idealism, to mention only two of the most prominent and verbose "-isms" which have been at feud with each other ever since philosophical thought arose. The Tantras, on the other hand, try to restore man and to grasp life in its entireness, which is neither an indulgence in passions, a succumbing to all sorts of distractions, nor a rejection and escape, but a complete reconciliation to the hard facts of life by seeing them just as they are, that is, neither as the one or as the other but as both together and a little more. Therefore also the Tantras do not take the examples for illustrating their aims from any particular philosophical system—in fact, they are thoroughly outspoken against every definite system, whether it be Brahmanical or Buddhistic, which plainly shows their unbiasedness and integrity of thought—but from everyday life where men and women meet and part, where emotions govern, lifting man up to dizzy heights or dragging him down into abysmal depths.

The most powerful emotions are linked up with the sex drive, which, according to the Buddhists, sets in not at puberty but is operating already pre-natally, determining the selection of the future parents and of the actual sex in embryonic development. This acknowledgment of sex as a most powerful motive as well as the unmistakably sexual language of the Tantras might easily mislead—and it actually has done so—a casual reader into a one-sided interpretation. That it is not merely a question of sexuality, is borne out by the many other injunctions given in the Tantras. Ever and again we are warned against the irresolute yielding to biological temptation. Therefore, a correct understanding can only be achieved if, on the one hand, we také the "sexual" language as a well-meaning guide for a mind, optimistically setting out on high philosophical flight, but coming to a tragic and untimely end as soon as an attractive female being crosses its path; and, on the other, as a symbol for human relationship in the most liberal sense. Thus, the Tantras are not at all speculative, but pre-eminently practical and up to the actual problems of life.

Human relationship is a problem both of the within and the without, and hence so aptly illustrated in the Tantras by the symbols of masculinity and femininity. For just as in the outer world we meet men and women and come into contact with them, so also within the human psyche there are the tender feminine traits in the soul of the male and the hard masculine traits in the soul of the female. But a lasting relationship between these two is not established by suppressing the one or the other.

Only when both elements are lived together, when both elements have attained the same level and are in a state of complete interpenetration and not of a mere side-by-side, a lasting relationship, liberating man from the fatally dangerous one-sidedness and the barbarism it entails, can be established. This establishment is a most hard task. No amount of self-deception will prevent man from facing the real facts. He may imagine to have achieved internally the most harmonious arrangement between masculinity and femininity, only to find out that his outward marriage breaks up before a divorce court. Or he may even be convinced to lead the most perfect marriage according to the accepted standard of society, only to suffer internally the hellish pains of obsessions, haunting fears, and other "nervous" diseases. The fact is that in all these cases there has never been achieved a lasting relationship but that there has lingered on only some sort of patchwork that breaks down at the slightest provocation, spreading disaster instead of radiating happiness and contentment. It is a far way to the state of *Yuganaddha* which symbolizes the harmonious union of the opposites as well as their transcendence. The insistence on the interplay between the within and the without makes the Tantras important works and valuable contributions both to the psychological and social aspects of human life, though the social aspect cannot be understood in the sense of political despotism and desperadoism but only in the sense of the relationship between the members of mankind in general. Not that the Tantras try to impose a new social order; on the contrary, they do not even say a word about it and their aim seems to be absolutely other-worldly. But this other-worldliness is the necessary corrective against a too much stressed worldliness to which the "sexual" language and aspect might give rise, though, as I have pointed out above, this sexual aspect is but the corrective against the one-sided intellectualism and rationalism of mere philosophy which is unable to cope with the problems of everyday life. History has shown that all the existing philosophies have revealed their inadequacies and have broken down, just as the social orders based upon them either have already broken down or are giving way to new forms. It is at this point that the Buddhist Tantras, particularly because of their unbiasedness and their going a middle path avoiding the extremes, come in as valuable guides to a new orientation of man's outlook. They do away with the artificially set up fences that separate man from man both mentally and socially. But this does not mean that the Tantras are advocates of social promiscuity—a freedom that is supposed to cover up the hideous mental inhibitions that go side by side with it, as the Western societies with their intolerant and aggressive mentality show day by day. The Buddhist sages who were better psychologists than our professionals and socially more valuable members than our law-givers, knew too well that man cannot be split up into social, mental, and moral parts as independent, autonomous units which leave man with no basis whatever for relating one part to any other. Therefore the Tantras are no handbook for revolutionaries or other well-meaning reformers of society. What the Tantras have to say must be lived in order to be understood. But to live and to understand needs courage and perseverance like everything that is great. The way, avoiding the easy and cheap extremes, is hard and beset with difficulties, for there is nothing to which we may cling, no outer conventions, no soothing beliefs. The way the Tantras point out and ask man to go is for the bold who "fearless like lions" venture upon new paths.

The symbol of Yuganaddha which points to the unique harmony and interpenetration of masculinity and femininity, of "blunt" truth and "symbolic" truth, of intelligence and emotionality, gives the solution to the problem that concerns each of us—the problem of how to solve the conflict that is raging within us and is fundamentally based upon the split between intellect and emotions. For while the intellect tells us one thing and pushes us one way, our emotions attached to outmoded scientific, philosophical, and theological doctrines push us another way, making us frustrated men, divided against ourselves. The symbol of Yuganaddha is therefore of utmost practical importance, for as a living entity born out of the *conjunctio oppositorum* it is within the reach of immediate apprehension and unlike a dead sign it does not refer to what only syntactically and postulationally formulated theory can designate. Thus the symbolism of the Buddhist Tantras accomplishes in a practical way what the Buddhist Sūtras and Śāstras attempted to do theoretically, to lead man to lasting peace and bliss.

* * *

In this book certainly not all problems have been solved. There are far too many problems connected with the Tantras and, in addition, the Tantras are still like a vast and almost impenetrable jungle into which one has to cut a path with painstaking labour. Often there are no adequate words to describe or to explain what one has seen and how it has affected one. This difficulty of access was also the reason that only the Buddhist Tantras have been consulted and no reference made to the non-Buddhist Tantras. Moreover, a comparative study of all Tantras, Buddhist and Hindu, is at the present stage of our knowledge as regards either branch, absolutely premature and would only make confusion worse. A mere collection of incidental similarities does not help us in understanding the import of the Tantras. If this book which is exclusively based upon an interpretation of the original sources and which deals only with a certain problem and its practical application in life—this problem may well be called the central problem of Tantra—should invite others to take up a thorough and unbiased study of Tantrism, it has served its purpose.

Readers who are interested in the general aspect of Tantrism may be recommended the works of Sir John Woodroffe, *alias* Arthur Avalon, dealing exclusively with the Hindu Tantras, and Shashi Bhusan Dasgupta, "An Introduction to Tāntric Buddhism," giving valuable material from manuscript sources in Sanskrit.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

The author takes this opportunity of recording his deep sense of gratitude to Acharya Narendra Deva, M. A., LL. B., D. Litt., Vice-Chancellor of Banaras Hindu University, and to Mahamahopadhyaya Gopinath Kaviraj, M. A., D. Litt., for the interest and encouragement these two great scholars showed in the publication of this book. The author is also greatly indebted to Upasaka Joseph E. Cann, who helped him in correcting the proof-sheets. If there should be still some misprints they are solely due to the author's oversight. Finally the author wants to thank Swami Agehananda for writing the Preface and Mr. Jayakrishna Das Gupta for having accepted the book for publication in the Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, (Studies).

Lucknow-Banaras

H. V. G.

# YUGANADDHA

## 1. Bisexuality as a Biological Factor.

The remarkable fact that man's highest aim, enlightenment (*bodhi, bodhicitta*), is thought to be an ambierotic state may cause some people to feel morally offended. They may, however, be reminded of the fact that the interpretation of the word sexuality varies greatly in different classes of society within the accepted and expected pattern of culture, and that this interpretation changes as soon as new cultural forms are developed. Moreover, the idea of bisexuality or ambieroticism is met with all over the world, among the most primitive tribes as well as among the most cultured society. This fact alone already gives evidence that it will not do to set up one's own peculiar prejudices as standards and that, above all limited dogmatic views and similar self-inflicted constraints and taboos, there is the ever-creative activity of the human psyche which does not conform to any accepted conventionality.

It is not possible also to consider this conception as an abnormality or pathological aberration, because all too frequently we do not know where the normal ends and where the abnormal begins. Normality and abnormality are culturally defined concepts. But only too often is culture considered as something external and in this way we overlook its tremendous inner power. And this leads us to the assumption that normality is identical with the standards of the average person. Yet it should not be forgotten that normality, inseparably connected with a norm which is always an ideal, is also spiritually founded. To be normal is certainly an ideal, but it must always be borne in mind that most of the so-called "normal" men are rather fragmentary specimens, in which some peculiarity or other has been highly developed at the expense of everything else. It is obvious, therefore, that normality must not be confused with the common valuations of normal and abnormal traits which appear not only premature but also rather questionable.

Bisexuality, or to emphasize its functional and dynamic aspect, ambieroticism, is both a psychological and a constitutional factor. If I discuss the constitutional aspect first I do so, because our "scientific" mind wants to start from observable facts. We know that the bisexual constitution exists potentially in equal male-female (M/F) ratios in conjugating reproductive protoplasm. It definitely exists in more or less unequal male-female (M/f) or female-male (F/m) ratios in the chromosomes and cytoplasm of zygotes of unifertile, heterosexual metazoa and in their gonads, germ cells, gametes and other cells of the organism. Furthermore, every being is made up of the genes of the two parents, which become united following fertilization of the female ovum by the male spermatozoon. These genes are, according to geneticists, the basic elements in heredity, the most minute particles of organic and living matter lying in the nuclei of the sex and somatic cells. They are best understood as indicators of what is to come in later bodily development. However, the biological characteristics are not so much the products of single genes but of combinations and recombinations of these elements; for the manner in which the products of the different genes react on each other is so complicated that no final product and no characteristic of the grown-up individual is due to any specific gene. Numerous genes take part in the production of any organ and characteristic. It is only the presence or absence of a particular combination of chromosomes, that is, genes organized into larger units, that determines whether the offspring will be a male or a female. Even the presence or absence of this combination is not solely the result of chance chromosomal accumulative organization of chance genic mutations which are under the directional limitation of the natural selection of more of the fittest phenotypes for survival and reproduction. Holistic autogenous determination in counterbalancing interaction with internal and external imbalancing conditions is the most fundamental characteristic of the whole process. Although these genes are not to be thought of as a static thing, they represent certain stable chemical and physical items in cell life, which is always a thoroughly dynamic system in a constantly changing state of molecular flux, a sort of an ever-active intracellular set of forces. The structure and function of the basic sustaining systems as well as of the endocrine glands are more or less dependent upon these determining factors whose constitution is at any given time dependent upon and influenced by antecedent states and environmental conditions, because they do not operate in a vacuum. In the regulation and control of the bodily functions, which are profoundly influenced by chemical processes, the endocrine (ductless) glands, forming a sort of interlocking directorate, have a definite place and there is a somewhat amazing inter-relation between the organization of genes and endocrine balance as well as imbalance. Although the precise function of the various endocrine glands is not fully known it is well established that tumors on the adrenal cortex are associated with a distinct tendency towards masculinity in females. The adrenal cortex, originating from the same urogenital ridge as the gonads, is more closely related to the gonadal medulla than to the gonadal cortex. Its hormone, cortine, is more androgenic than estrogenic and has M/f differentiating cytoplasmic effects upon the growth of the genitals, the skin, the hair, and other sex characteristics as well as on sex behaviour. With the adrenals there is distinctly bound up the functioning of the pituitary and of the gonads, which two again are closely related to each other. In women sexual function seems to be affected by a form of "remote" control from the hormones of the anterior lobe of the pituitary; if the secretion of the prepituitary fails, the function of the gonads is depressed; a removal of the gonads, on the other hand, causes a change both in the structure of the anterior lobe of the pituitary and in its hormone content. Therefore, any malfunction or imbalance of the endocrine system has a widespread influence on human behaviour or what is called masculinity and femininity. This influence, of course, is chiefly indirect, the glands operating through the whole constitutional system.

It is true, men and women vary in regard to endocrine balance, and the sexuality of women is clearly more complex and complicated than that of men. A man will never fully understand the physiological imbalance produced by menstruation, gestation, childbirth, lactation. For this reason it will not do to ignore the influence which these factors have upon women's emotional life. But it would be a gross error to assume that there is a complete sexual divergence between the male and the female from each other. Morphologically and physiologically the two sexes are not analogous to two species, masculinity and emininity are but extremes in distribution of characteristics which have much in common. There are certain males who have an organic predisposition to assume a somewhat feminine life organization and even tend to resemble the modal female physical habitus, and there are females who assume masculine roles and attitudes accompanied by an almost complete reversal of their "normal" sexual roles. There can be no doubt that in cases where female endocrine-bearing tissue is found in males, such constitutional foundations have possible effects on emotional and temperamental habits. Even if the serious instances of endocrine malfunctioning are disregarded, that is to say, impotency in males who are consequently not considered "men" and infertile women who feel that their lives are frustrated, by reason of the bisexual nature of man, there is a chance that at any time an individual may have masculinity or femininity as the ascendent function. All this shows that the exclusively virile men and the exclusively feminine female do not exist and that even the over-development of masculine traits in males and feminine traits in females is, in the light of the true nature of man, not worth striving after, because either aspect represents but a fraction of all the potentialities of the original protoplasm. This is what physiology has to say.

———

## 2. The Unity of Body and Soul.

Although much has been learned by studying the chemistry of living cells and tissues it would be erroneous to regard these physiological factors which appear to govern masculinity and femininity as causes of the bisexual nature of man. They are much more a symptom or a syndrome. The human reality is not and must not be regarded as something material or as made up of biological reactions to chemical stimuli. These are only one aspect and not even the most important one. The materialistic view is tantamount to denying altogether the covert activity, the internal and subjective, the rather autonomous world of imagination and thought in the broadest sense. Although to a certain extent man is subject to nature and subject to nature's laws marked by relative fixity providing the basis for consistency and stability of structure and function which are evident in many of the underlying physiological activities of the individual, yet flexibility is never absent. This fact is witnessed in the relative freedom of operation, in the changeability and variability of adaptive responses. There are many phases of human activity which are certainly not to be explained in terms of simple stimulus-response "psychology", and, what is more, no two individuals will react in exactly the same way. There is also increasing evidence that emotions, feelings, habits, and ideas may profoundly influence the physiological functions and hence the homeostatic balance of the body. The chemical and physical processes associated with mental and emotional processes are closely interconnected and of an exceedingly delicate nature. Since we simply do not know what the physical and mental processes are in many instances it is not at all out of the question that the physical as well as the psychic processes are only the two aspects of one and the same unitary principle, whatever we may call it, which for reasons of cognizance we have tried to split up into two disjunct factors which constantly get mixed up with each other. This division of man into body and soul has proved to be rather unsatisfactorv for understanding man's real nature. The dualism of body and soul made man forget the whole and induced him to attach too great a value to theorization, to mistake a theory for reality itself, while, as a matter of fact, a theory is but an "approach" and, for this reason, must always stand back against reality. The habit of idolatrously taking the manifestation for the principle always led man to reduce the reality to some material by-product or other, to a physiological reflex phenomenon, to some drive or other: in other words he conceived man as a tool for making tools, as controlled either by sexual or aggressive drives, as a product of social and economic pressures, as a bundle of conditioned reflexes, a "nothing but."

To him who has been brought up in a strict dualism of body and soul, the Indian conception of man's highest aim as two in one, that is, the inseparability of body and soul as well as of masculinity and femininity as an integral whole, is almost incomprehensible. The following remarks are, therefore, essential to an approach to understanding.

"The experience of pure bliss and the body schema (*kāya*) that is still undifferentiated like the *rohita* fish (Cyprinus Rohita) are instantaneous comprehension *ekakṣaṇābhisaṁbodhi*). They are that unique moment when in pre-natal growth (i. e. in germinal and embryonic development) the *ālayavijñāna* is about to enter upon its course of development and transformation within the maternal uterus, because the female ovum and the male spermatozoon (*bindu*) have met and become united (*samarasībhūta*).

"But when the latent energies of the five receptive patterns that have been constellated by the residua of former experiences of visible objects and other sense objects (*vāsanā*) become active within the fetus in the same way as a turtle puts forward its five limbs (i. e. the four legs and the head), then there is fivefold comprehension (*pañcākārābhisaṁbodhi*).

"When the fetus becomes differentiated and acquires the twenty functional factors, because the five receptive patterns, each in its own proper place, act on and are modified by the four elements of earth and so on (*pṛthivyādicaturdhātuvāsanābheda*), then there is twentifold comprehension (*viṁśatyākārābhisaṁbodhi*).

"When the newborn child encounters and experiences (i.e. variously identifies himself with) innumerable forms of existence, which are like a net of illusory ascriptions (*māyājālābhisambodhi*)."[1]

For the sake of simplicity I begin with the analysis of the second and third items of this description of human growth and development, which goes on absolutely passively according to the laws of nature without the individual's knowing anything about it. We easily recognize the interplay of intrinsic and extrinsic factors, as we are accustomed to say. We know that some of the determinants of structure and function are intrinsic to the protoplasm and are dependent upon heredity. We have to bear in mind, however, that heredity is but a convenient term for the transmittance from parents to offspring of certain features in cellular life. The five receptive patterns that are developed during pre-natal life are the important factors of responsiveness to warm and cold stimuli, the nociceptors or pain senses, which may be comprised under the tactile sense, as well as the rudimentary senses of taste, smell, audition, and vision. These all may be considered as a sort of internal environment (*vāsanā, bīja*). This internal environment has become highly standardized and regular. It has an important place in determining the reactions of the cells to each other and to outside forces of external environment. In other words, the inner constitution determines the final form of response. However, the so-called hereditary factors can only be acquired in response to an environment, and likewise the so-called acquired factors can only be secured by a modification of already existing structure. If there were no hereditary highly standardized and consistent chromosomal regulations of cytoplasmic qualities, life would be too highly variable to form well organized tissues in organisms. Hereditary chromosomal qualitative and environmental acquired quantitative determination of the cytoplasm enables each generation of cells to adapt itself to its special intracellular and extracellular environment conditions. In this way it is also enabled to form and to differentiate organs to fit into the special bio-electrical fields of the organism as a whole. The interplay between intrinsic and extrinsic factors is expressed in the text by the statement that the receptive sensory-motor patterns, which are transmitted from parents to children as hereditary factors, begin to act on environment, that is, on the elements. These, in turn, act through and upon the hereditary factors. In other words, genetic and external factors operate conjointly in the whole of life. In the Indian texts this complicated interaction is hinted at by the *niṣyandavāsanā*, those factors which reproduce only special types of uniform unicellular organisms or masses of cells of one type, and by the *karmavāsanā*, the environmental quantification of chromosomal cytoplasmic qualification. Both factors together form and differentiate the living organisms.

---

[1] Sekoddeśaṭīkā of Naḍapāda (Nāropā), (Gaekwad's Oriental Series, No. xc), p. 6.

Intrinsic and extrinsic factors are, after all, not two different forces but only the two aspects of one unitary principle, which may be called energy or whatever we like. We might even call this unitary principle God if this designation had not become unsatisfactory because of the many contradictory notions which attach to this term in occidental countries. Moreover, the Indian conception of God is quite different from the western one; therefore by using this term misunderstandings would constantly arise. However, if we omit the term God we remain exact scientists, who prefer to solve their problems without recourse to God. But at the same time we disregard an emotional tone that is never absent in real life. From a scientific point of view all that is met with either within or without is energy in itself, which by appearance is a manifestation of it. This energy is the *ālayavijñāna* or *bindu* which is known to contain all sorts of contraries, that is, subject and object, beginning and end, within and without, male and female, and so on. All these contraries are latent potentialities.

As soon as energy manifests itself it is polarized into two forms and the actual condition and position of any given object is simply the resultant of these two co-existent or concurrent activities and not the result alone of the most obvious stimulus that is apparently calling it forth. Thus, for instance, in the tissues of the living organism the operative energy is polarized into anabolism and katabolism, the one tending to conserve and the other to change the tissue. The assimilation and building of energy, anabolism, is the opposite of breaking down and releasing energy. Cells that are anabolically strong are often katabolically weak and vice verse. The continuity of an orderly, graded, breaking down katabolism is indispensable for life, because it is a means of supplying energy for the completion and differentiation of anabolism. Only thus it is kept in a state of ready reactivity and structuralizing movement of kinetic potentials, and only thus its freezing, stasis, and collapse is prevented. The living cell's bidynamics is important for the development of the two sexes, in as much as by increase of heat over the equilibratory mean a differentiation in the male-female (M/f, A— K+) direction sets in, whereas by decrease of heat under the equilibrating mean a differentiation in the female-male (F/m, A+K—) direction sets in.

Every manifestation of energy has thoroughly fascinating qualities and forces the individual to identify himself with these manifestations so that he experience himself as a man or a woman. To the imperfect eye, to the spirit still toiling through the lower planes of time, space, and causation, the whole process of becoming is tending to appear and this appearance is taken for reality. But when he succeeds in piercing through the veil of phenomenal flow he will learn that he encounters but himself everywhere in innumerable disguises and, by carefully analyzing these fascinations that have held him in slavish dependence, he will see that the being of creatures is but a reflection and participation of his. The phenomena are not a deception but an occasion for it. Through them we have a bewildering partial consciousness which loses sight of the reality and lives in this world of phenomena. The glamour of the universe casts its spell on us and we become slaves. But when we shatter all forms and get behind the veil we find reality and become free. Even when man is on the level of objective nature, when he falsely identifies himself with the objective world, he is not utterly lost, for the Supreme operates at all levels of being. Matter, too, is a manifestation of it. We can burst the circle of nature when we turn away from the surface and plunge deep into the source. Then we cease to belong to that which is moved about. This realization of the vital unity of soul and body in man even on the level of objective nature is meant by the fourth item of the text mentioned above.

By the fact that the body schema (*kāya*) and bliss (*sukha*) belong together two problems have been hinted at: the problem of the perception of the body and the problem of the relationship of the unconscious and conscious body ego to mind. Here we have one of the earliest splits in the ego between the body and all that which can become conscious to form the body ego and the psychic reality or inner world. The structural concept of a body schema ( kāya ) describes the conscious and unconscious integration which exists before the split into external world and psyche. That this body schema is bliss shows what happens in an individual when the illusions of the previously rigid boundaries between mind and body are given up. When the mind loses the need for a soul or a psychic apparatus separate from all he calls his body and his world, it gains conscious access to and control of the superficies and of the depth. This Indian concept of a body schema is closely connected with what modern depth-psychology has found out. The modern body schema has been defined by Clifford M. Scott as follows: "The body schema refers to that conscious or unconscious integrate of sensations, perceptions, conceptions, affects, memories and images of the body from its surface to its depths and from its surface to the limits of space and time. I am referring to a conscious or unconscious integrate of sensations, perceptions, conceptions, affects, memories and images of the body, etc., but this is not all. This integrate deals with a spread of contents from a surface boundary outwards to the limits of space and time and inwards to the depths of one's inner life and to the limits of memory and anticipation. In other words, part of the body schema is a continually changing world scheme, the extended limits of which have to deal with what can only be called the limits of space and time, and with a continually changing lifetime scheme of memory and anticipation"[1] It is not to be wondered at that modern depth-psychology comes to similar observations as Buddhism. Contrary to all "psychological" theories modern depth-psychology has to deal with the actual man and not with what theories want man to be. The deceptive duality of the psyche as opposed to the body is in no way different from the illusion that masculinity and femininity are two different factors. Valuable informations about the basic unity of masculinity and femininity may be gathered from the Buddhist Tantric texts. The problem of masculinity and femininity is not the idle play of an intellectual mind, it affects our life deeply and we have to come to an understanding of what is operating in us. The Tantras may help us in our present difficulty if they are understood correctly.

## 3. The Symbolic Character and Emotional Value of Bisexuality.

From what we have discussed it is clear that the idea of bisexuality is not an internalization of overt activity, that is, a carry-over into the inner being, into memory and associative functions, of the various stimulus-response patterns of a reorganization of various aspects of perceptual experiences of overt activity. This idea is a projection out of man's inmost and fundamental nature, a divination of what may be and of what is waiting to be realized. The inseperability of masculinity and femininity is a symbol for the true man. The word symbol is used here, for want of another and better term, in the sense of a content in which the divergent tendencies of the human being are harmoniously united on a common basis, but not in the sense of an abbreviated substitute for something else that is well known. While a sign denotes something that is already well known the symbol has a prospective character. For this reason it serves as a power device, dominating and controlling the whole attitude of the individual. It is of utmost functional importance. We know that any organism tends to meet unusual situations by a rapid mobilization of energy. Thus, for instance, under condition of great physical exercises, of asphyxia, of general anesthesia and the like, the sympathetic nervous system, aided by adrenine, brings about an energizing of the skeletal muscles and of the involuntary processes that are necessary for survival. While organically these critical situations have to do with bodily survival at the biological level, under critical psychic conditions, which are known to bring about similar, if not identical physiological effects, the symbol takes on the character of a stimulus or of an incitement to activity. It stimulates the release of energy so that the individual is enabled to meet the unusual situation or crises which demand some sort of adjustment, because life does not admit of coming to a standstill. Therefore, the origination of a symbol is always connected with a state of disequilibrium dangerous to life. But at the same time the symbol also is an indicator of the goal in which the lost balance will be restored. In other words, the symbol is both a stimulus and a response which the individual makes to this stimulus. Moreover, every symbol is linked up with a distinct feeling-emotional tone that is proportional to the function it has to fulfill. That is to say, the more intense the feeling-emotional tone of a symbol, the greater is its importance for the life of the individual. The incipient reaction to the symbol may be thought of as a method of releasing tensions. Such releases occur through the consummatory final response. When the solution of the tension is attained the individual passes into a state of satisfaction, complacency and relaxation. The feeling of pleasure and the sense of security remain. These pleasant feelings following successful issues of a cycle of activity indicate that the goal has been attained. The former sense of strain or stress has given way, What previously seemed to be utter darkness is dispersed by brightest rays of light.

---

[1] W. Clifford M. Scott, A problem of Ego Structure, pp. 74 sq. [= The Psychoanalytic Quarterly, vol. xvii, 1948, No. 1, pp. 71=83].

"In the same way as the moon-stone sheds its light in deep darkness, so highest bliss instantly dissipates all miseries",[1] says Saraha.

But unfulfilled impulses or uncompleted cycles of activity are likely to leave a residuum of unpleasant feelings and emotions. This shows that feelings and emotions form a substratum to the whole series of overt trials and to the internal and anticipatory processes which characterize the efforts to find the solution. In other words, feelings and emotions are basic to all cycles of activity and represent the fact that the organism remains in a state of disequilibrium until the solution of the problem is at hand.

From the very beginning the idea of enlightenment, expressed under the symbol of the conjunction of the two sexes, has been linked up with a most intensive emotion

---

[1] M. Shahidullah, Les Chants Mystiques de Kāṇha et de Saraha [=Textes pour l'étude du Bouddhism tardif], Paris 1928, verse 99;

*ghorandhārē canda-maṇi jima ujjoa karei*
*parama-mahāsuha ekhu khaṇē duriāsesa harei*

which is called bliss (*sukha, mahāsukha*). Every other feeling of pleasure is transitory, because in it there is still a residuum of unpleasant feeling which will enforce a new cycle of activity. Indrabhūti, speaking of enlightenment as pure bliss, says:

> "The All-Buddha-Knowledge which is to be experienced within one's inmost self is called Great Bliss (*mahāsukha*), because it is the most excellent of all pleasures".[1]

Advayavajra states that

> "Without bliss there is no enlightenment, for enlightenment is bliss itself".[2]

Anangavajra says that

> "It is thought of as sublime Great Bliss, because its nature is infinite bliss. It is most gratifying, most sublime and conducive to enlightenment".[3]

Similarly Kāṇha states that

> "The whole world together with its deeds, words, and thoughts vanishes into thin air. This fading away means that Great Bliss and Nirvāṇa are one and the same ( experience )".[4]

---

[1] Jñānasiddhi of Indrabhūti [=Gaekwad's Oriental Series, No. xliv, Two Vajrayāna Works], VII 3:

*sarvatāthāgataṁ jñānaṁ svasaṁvedyasvabhāvakaṁ*
*sarvasaukhyāgrabhūtatvāt mahāsukham iti smṛtaṁ*

[2] Mahāsukhaprakāśa [=G. O. Series, No. Xl, Advayavajrasaṁgraha]:

*sukhābhāve na bodhiḥ syāt matā yā sukharūpiṇī*

[3] Prajñopāyaviniścayasiddhi of Anaṅgavajra [=G. O. Series, No. Xliv], I 27:

*anantasukharūpatvāt Śrīmahāsukhasaṁjñitam*
*samantabhadram agryaṁ tad abhisaṁbodhikārakaṁ*

[4] M. Shahidullah, Les Chants Mystiques de Kāṇha et de Saraha [Textes pour l'étude du Bouddhism tardi], verse 27:

*saba jagu kāa-bak-maṇa mili biphuraī tahiso dūre*
*so eho bhaṅge mahāsuha nibbāṇa ekhu re*

Finally I mention the words of Saraha :—

"Oh son, reality has a marvellous taste ; it is impossible to express its nature in words. It is beyond thought-constructions ( i. e. beyond all intellectual concepts ) ; it is the place of Bliss ; it is the most excellent experience. Here the world is born".[1]

All this shows that the ideal of the inseparability of enlightement and bliss corresponds to a content of highest tension which nowhere appears in conscious life. As long as this content has not been experienced within one's inmost self and become an inalienable possession, it will be perceived by the individual in a symbolic form by way of projection only, that is to say, this content which is reality itself and yet waiting to be realized, a remote possibility and yet the most present fact, will be thought of as lying outside ourselves. The yearning for enlightenment and the constant endeavour to achieve this goal are but the indication of the individual's sense of tension resulting from disequilibrium, and of the initial seeking to release this tension. Somehow the individual is aware of the fact that any sense of satisfaction and security derived by submission to a specific place in the social world is bought at the price of his very own nature and that his true nature has been jeopardized. As long as the goal is not attained the feeling of unpleasantness will persist. Since life seems to make for this goal we may say that the whole life of an individual represents a cycle of activity with the end to secure the reduction of tension. As I have pointed out before, any partial response is unsatisfactory and, therefore, until the attainment of the goal is achieved, new cycles of activity will ensue. Applied to the belief in rebirth this means that every existence, representing a cycle of activity, is followed by another, when only a partial and ineffective response has been made. Someone might make the objection that we do not know anything about the individual existence after death and that it cannot be proved by exact science. He may be reminded of the fact that death means only the end of our conscious existence and that our ego-consciousness is not ultimate reality. Moreover, individual existence after death is of no account. Every individual is a manifestation of what we have called energy and our individual ego-consciousness with which our existence in this world is linked up is but a rather small appearance in the cage of time, space, and causality, it is a momentary section of the whole. Energy as a whole is capable of endless transformations so that one appearance is followed by another. Therefore, there is neither absolute identity nor absolute diversity. The idea that the human existence is part of the whole and the fact that every partial and unfulfilled response is a retention of unpleasant states account for the fact that the repeated re-appearance of an individual on this world is unpleasantness ( *duḥkha* ). We suffer, because we have become alienated from the whole, because our ego, in its self-confinement, in its dependence on something alien, is a distortion of the true nature.

---

[1] Saraha 54 :
*are putta ! tatta bicitta rasa kahaṇa ṇa sakkai batthu*
*kappa-rahia suha-ṭhāṇu baru jaga ubajjaī tatthu*

## 4. The Status of the World and its Dependence on Drives.

"The circle of existences is of unknown origin. No beginning is known for the beings who walk and run (from one existence to another), prevented from (attaining their goal) by ignorance and fettered by the thirst (for continued existence). For this reason, unpleasantness has been experiencad for a long time, pain has been experienced, loss has been experienced, and the cremation ground has been filled".[1]

This important and famous passage from the old Pāli Canon answers the question, "what makes an organism go", or, put otherwise, "what motivates an individual to an adaptation?" The basic stimulus which makes an individual avoid negative experiences and seek positive ones is the drive (*tṛṣṇā, taṇhā*). As must be pointed out, "drive" is but a convenient term to describe a certain early temporal phase in adjustive activity going on between a state of disequilibrium and one of balance. This latter state may be called a goal or an end. The attainment of the goal by the reduction of tension or the satisfaction of the drive generally leads to a state of equilibrium, which is accompanied by a sense of pleasure and relaxation. But as long as the drive remains unsatisfied and unfulfilled, a residuum of unpleasant feeling, however small it may be, remains and a new cycle of activity will ensue, the first stage of which is a need, a want or a drive resulting from disequilibrium. According to the Buddhist texts the drive is concomitant to "ignorance" (*avidyā, avijjā*). Ignorance does not mean intellectual stupidity, but spiritual blindness and darkness, the inability to see the inner light, that which endures and is imperishable, untouched by death, decay or corruption. In this respect ignorance is marked by a considerable lack in proper adjustment. In addition to this inability to adjust oneself to the demands of life it denotes the state of imbalance together with the ensuing drive in the proper sense of the word as well as the initial seeking of the stimulus or situation which will satisfy this need. The attempt, however, to avoid the tension which is felt as negative and to secure the reduction of tension felt as positive, will fail unless the veil of darkness is torn. Otherwise man will behave like someone in a dark chamber. Trying to find something he stumbles over the chairs and even gets hurt. This state of tension from which man is suffering has been described in the following way: "There is this state of disequilibrium and drive (*taṇhā*), ensnaring, moving (man) about, diffused fettering, by which this world is stimulated, attacked, disarranged like a weft and entangled like a ball of string, a chaos like that of Muñja (Saccharum munja Roxb.) and Babbaja (Bleusine indica) grass; it does not pass beyond lowly forms of life, sorrowful existences, perdition, and the circle of births".[1] Or elsewhere it has been said: "Caught in a state of disequilibrium and fallen into the meshes of drives (*taṇhādutiya*) man goes his long way and does not pass beyond the circle of births, existence here and existence there".[2] The goal, however, where the lost balance has been found again and where the light of wisdom has dissipated the darkness of spiritual blindness, has been characterized in the following words: "The appeasement of all activity (i. e. acting only in a detached spirit), the renunciation of all wordly means of subsistance, the relaxation of tension (i.e. the exhaustion of the power of the drives, (*taṇhakkhaya*), cessation, Nirvāṇa".[3]

---

[1] Saṁyutta-Nikāya II 179.

It has to be borne in mind, however, that in some drive-to-goal relations there is essentially an effort to secure more and more of the satisfying stimulus or situation until release of the disturbing tension or of the state of disequilibrium is attained. Thus, for instance, an organism, though incited by disturbing tensions and drives, by the process of reflex circular action continues to absorb more and more of the satisfying stimulus, as in eating and drinking. Also the whole range of love reactions takes on this character, from the tactile stimulation of the erogenous areas of the body to the other items in the love life of the adults. In the same way, training in social contact leads to a continued desire for companionship and for the other things of which we are accustomed to say "the more we get the more we want". This continuation shows that there is still some unpleasant feeling-emotional tone. The effort was to avoid the more negative situation and to secure the less negative situation. These drives which continue even after the consummatory response are called adient, and, this sort of repetition falls under the head of perseverance. In the Buddhist texts the two terms "thirst for continued existence" (*bhavataṇhā*) and 'thirst for pleasure" (including sex, *kāmataṇhā*) are used for our concepts of adience and perseverance. Buddhaghosa speaks of these two concepts in the following way:

---

[1] Aṅguttara-Nikāya II 211. [2] Aṅguttara-Nikāya II 10.

[3] Aṅguttara-Nikāya II 34

" "The thirst for the objects" (*rūpataṇhā*) is called "thirst for pleasure" (*kāmataṇhā*), when an object comes into the range of visual consciousness and when this thirst continues to absorb the object because of its pleasurable stimulus [i. e. adience]. But when this thirst is continued with the idea of permanence, that is, (when the subject desires that) the object should be lasting and eternal, then it is called "thirst for continued existence" (*bhavataṇhā*) [i. e. perseverance]; for a desire accompanied by the idea of permanence is called "thirst for continued existence" ".[1]

---

[1] **Visuddhimagga, pp. 567 sq.**

However, even the most attractive stimuli lose their appeal with persistent presentation and absorption. One palls in time at love making. Repeated contact with people leads to a state of discomfort and one wants to be alone for a time. In other words, the satiation of an adient drive often leads to a shift from adience to avoidance. There is a distinct limit to perseveration. Avoidance has been termed "thirst for discontinuance" (*vibhavataṇhā*). Buddhaghosa says:

"When (this thirst) is accompanied by the idea of annihilation, that is, (when the subject desires that) the object should break up and perish, then it is called "thirst for discontinued existence" (*vibhavataṇhā*); for the desire accompanied by the idea of annihilation is called "thirst for discontinued existence" ".[1]

In the same way as an adient drive may become an avoidant drive, so also the more avoidant drives may change their meaning for the individual. Society, culture, ideas, and learning constantly interfere with and qualify the drives and cycles of activity. Therefore it is not at all an easy thing to define a drive as to adience or avoidance. The problem is still much more complicated. In course of time the individual learns to thrust some of his anticipatory activities into the future as the basis of a line of action. These are referred to as ideals, as for instance enlightenment, but when we talk of them, we are but stating in another way the principle of internal drive which is directed towards some goal. These ideals, moreover, serve to set off many cycles of long-time activity which may be finally ended when many years have elapsed. But it should never be forgotten that the deeply perseverative character of many of our drives, whether we think of them in connection with long-time cycles of activity or of the many subsidiary cycles may rather obviously prevent an efficient adaptation, not only to a particular situation but also to the final goal, whatever this may be. The inertia of our habitual patterns is all too evident, and it is always up to the individual to overcome this inertia in some way or other. We establish habits in order to escape the time-and effort-consuming procedure of applying our mental gifts to new tasks. The function of habits in our lives is primarily to do away with the faint vestige of spiritual growth. How strong the inclination to stagnate is in man, becomes most evident when we analyze beliefs. The core of every belief is prejudice. Swayed by emotions we make an unjustified generalization. Habits which prevent us from applying new knowledge, and beliefs which prevent us from acquiring new knowledge, impair our spiritual growth considerably. Only when the individual succeeds in overcoming his inertia, when he does not fall a prey to either habits or beliefs, to either adience or avoidance, he may safely walk the way towards enlightenment, which transcends all contraries. Only in the world of becoming, in saṁsāra, we have the conflict between the two opposites. But why is there the world with its perpetual strife between the opposites ? We cannot account for the fact of the world as little as we can explain the fact that there are elephants. With our gross eyes we only see the manifestation, but since this manifestation is but the superficies which may be broken through, we are able to find liberation. Liberation is not clinging to one of the contraries. It is not the isolation of an allegedly immortal soul from the mortal human body but is the transfiguration of the whole man. When everything works flawlessly together and attains the rhythm expressed in the ecstasy of bliss, wisdom and intensity of energy, man is liberated. He is not dissolved into nothingness but he has become pure and transparent, he has become his own masterpiece. That man must pass beyond the struggle of the drives and must not have a predelection for anyone has been clearly expressed by Candrakīrti who states that

---

[1] Visuddhimagga, p. 568

"Those who try to solve the problems of life (*bhavasya niḥsaraṇaṁ*) either by perseverance (*bhava*) or by avoidance (*vibhava*) have no true knowledge. Both these aspects have to bo given up. the adient drive (*bhave tṛṣṇā*) as well as the avoidant drive (*vibhave tṛṣṇā*)".[1]

* * *

## 5. Drive and Spirit.

Not only are there many drives which cannot be resolved into a single one without rather exiguous reasoning, but they also manifest themselves on different levels. Moreover, there is a constant intermeshing of one drive with another. For this reason it is not to be wondered at that man is such a contradictory and complicated being that cannot be caught in cleverly devised theories. Whatever appears before our eyes may be this one or that one but never will it be one thing exlcusively. In what way a manifestation is dealt with depends on the attitude of the individual. The concept of attitude proves to be very useful, since it gives a clue to the unraveling of human motives and lines of action. An attitude is essentially an internally aroused set of mental-motor predisposition of the individual towards some specific or general stimulus. For this reason it is highly selective. It excludes everything that does not fit into the particular line of action. The building up of an attitude is so largely unconscious that often we are not at all aware of how it arises. Often a marginal impression is sufficient to determine the individual's response, because this tangential stimulation touches off and brings to light the deep-lying attitude. This is especially observable in the case history of neuroses, but is also seen in quite "normal" specimens. On the other hand, attitudes may be learned, that is, education, environmental influences and the many experiences made in the course of life, are active in building an attitude. Whatever may be the origin of an attitude, it is essentially the resultant of all the forces operating in life. The most important feature of an attitude, however, is its directionality. Not only does an attitude mark the inception of a response to a certain situation, but it also gives direction to the ensuing action. Therefore, it is not only selective, as pointed out above, it is also characterized by emotionally toned approach and withdrawal, rejection and acceptance, likes and dislikes, adient and avoident tendencies. There can be no doubt that the attitude of an individual, be it innate or acquired, deeply influences the whole furniture of inner life and hence the individual's overt conduct. Any change in an attitude will alter the energic ratio. Sometimes a change in an attitude is indispensable for the continuity of life. Such a change will come when, for instance, the one-sidedness of the conscious attitude of man has lost the contact with the deeper layers of the human nature. Although an attitude is not at all a static feature of the individual and constantly enters new constellations and combinations it is the decisive factor for what is placed foremost. It is due to the attitude if a drive dominates or if spirituality is the main line of action. Under the influence of an attitude even drives take on different meanings. It is true, the strongest drives postulate and even enforce their fulfillment with reference to their objective, but it will not do to value them as to the biological function exclusively. If the attitude is directed more to spirituality than to the satiation of the drive in the biological realm, the drive takes on a certain "meaning" and the undeniable biological function is only syndromic. When this happens it is almost impossible to say what is drive and what is spirit. In the same way as body and soul are a unity so also drive and spirit are an unsoluble medley. Neither can exist in isolation. The conflict between drive and spirit ensues only when one pole is unduly stressed. So, when the whole is disequilibrated at one time the drive, at another time the spirit tries to get hold of and to subdue the opponent. Even if the one or the other succeeded in doing so it would be a violation but not a solution of the conflict. A solution is achieved when the lost balance has been restored, when the dualism of drive and spirit has become meaningless. Because of the fundamental unity of drive and spirit the concept of sublimation in the strictly psychoanalytical sense of the upward shifting of the libido from channel to channel in the direction of that which is socially more acceptable is open to doubt. The spirit is not a derivate of the drive. Man is not primarily an instinctive being and secondarily a spiritual one. He is both at the same time. Spirituality is not a substitute, a canalization or draining off of physiological impulses into activities considered culturally proper and acceptable, it is another aspect of unity. Therefore we also must refrain from judging the one or the other. As soon as we call something good or bad we fall a prey to one-sidedness, and one-sidedness is always based on evil. Repressing the drive is as bad as excluding the spirit. Man will have to suffer for such a procedure. I have discussed the problem of drive and spirit at length, because only from this complication the erotic language of the Buddhist Tantras becomes intelligible. Also the distinction between "conventional truth" (*saṁvṛtisatya* ) and "symbolic truth" ( *paramārthasatya* ) will present no difficulties for an understanding. The "conventional truth'' is the self-representation of the drive; the "symbolic truth" is the spiritual meaning of the instinctive drive. Needless to say that here the spiritual meaning serves as a gateway into something beyond and transcends the dualism of drive and spirit which only belongs to the lower world.

---

[1] Madhyamakavṛtti, p. 530

Man's yearning is directed towards entireness. Man wants to have what once fell asunder, reunited on a plane where the danger of a split is eliminated. But to speak of a reunion or a fitting together of the contraries is rather incorrect, because it fosters a view of the true nature of man as a mere summation of disjunct parts or elements. It would have been more correct to say that man's integral nature is the experience of the inseparability of the contraries, the unity of what in this world appears as man and woman. This experience is a contact with the living reality which does not know any limitation and exclusiveness. Since this experience is beyond the rigid conceptual dualism, the nature of which is limitation, it does not lead to sterile sophistry but offers peace and bliss to man suffering from the self-imposed constraints. It creates a deep understanding of life and world. No longer will the contraries be able to worry man, because in this realm of Reality there is no duality. A completely new point of view has been found. What formerly was looked at from without is seen from within ; but within and without have become meaningless, because all dualistic modes have been transcended. It is true that there is something tranquil, peaceful, and silent about this new point of view, but it would be a gross error to conceive this tranquillity as inactivity, laziness or self-contained contemplativeness. It is unending work. It can only be described in antinomies, because there is not a single word in our languages which could convey the exact meaning of this "Thundering silence". Anaṅgavajra has said about this state :

"Neither duality nor non-duality, peaceful (or: tranquil, *śānta*), gratifying, everywhere present, to be experienced within one's inmost self, unswerving, undisturbed is this susceptibility full of wisdom (*prajñā*) and activity full of loving compassion (*upāya*)".[1]

This harmony of wisdom (*prajñā*) and action (*upāya*), of rest and movement, makes man free, because everything that is done by him now is born out of the whole. Man's action is no longer dictated by a sudden impulse. Such actions are but spasmodic, signs of constraint. If man's action is without this inner support it vanishes into thin air: if the inner quality cannot be expressed in activity it is a barren abstraction. Both factors together are freedom, that is, freedom from all unnatural impediments. I have refrained from saying that man's action has become full of meaning, because such a statement might create serious misunderstandings. The one thing that hampers our life is the concept of teleology which is made to be felt by us in every phase of our life. As long as we are on the plane of the teleological conception of existence, we are not free. When we are conscious of any purpose in our

---

1. Prajñopāyaviniścayasiddhi I 20:
*na dvayaṁ nādvayaṁ śāntaṁ śivaṁ sarvatra saṁsthitaṁ*
*pratyātmavedyam acalaṁ prajñopāyam anākulaṁ*

movements we are fettered and we become moral and intellectual people at best. We cease to be religious. To be free means purposelessness, genuineness of motive, distinterestedness of feeling, and immediateness of response. When there is thus no crookedness in the heart we are free. In this there is something highly religious. Of this freedom it has been said in the Vimalakīrtinirdeśasūtra:

"Action which is without wisdom is spasmodic action (*bandha*, a fetter which binds us to an object and has us making calculations as to the effects of our doing); wisdom which cannot be expressed in action is a barren abstraction (*bandha*, a sort of spiritual fetter that makes us get lost to the work we have to do in our terrestrial existence). Action combined with wisdom is freedom (*mokṣa*); wisdom combined with action is freedom. The intrinsic nature of these two in one, comparable with the inseparability of the lamp and the light, is deemed to be the true nature of man (*sahajasiddha*). Thus the true teacher (*sadguru*) has given his instruction".[1]

Only that man who is free, because he does not blindly follow his drives and sudden impulses and who does not get lost in the world of pictures his soul conjures up before his eyes, may say that he is in a state of bliss, that he is bliss himself. So also Advayavajra states that

"The judicious man who has fully experienced that man's inmost nature is wisdom and action in one (*prajñopāyātmyakaṁ tattvaṁ*), because (his mind) has been swept clear of (such conceptual dirt as) the without and the within, is in a state of bliss (*sukhita*). There are no longer spasmodic efforts (*asthānayogataḥ*)".[1]

---

[1] Quoted by Advayavajra, p. 2; *prajñārahita upāyo bandhaḥ, upāyarahitā prajñā bandhaḥ, prajñāsahita upāyo mokṣaḥ, upāyasahitā prajñā mokṣaḥ. tādâtmyaṁ cânayoḥ sadgurūpadeśataḥ pradīpâlokayor iva sahajasiddham evādhigamyate.*

There is some reason in calling this mutual penetration of masculinity and femininity, of male power to mould and of female susceptibility, the highest value. The unitive knowledge of masculinity and femininity as an indivisible whole is a reconciliation with whatever we encounter in life. It is, as it were, a curative treatment of our wounds inflicated by the painful fetters of separateness. The fetters have fallen off; they will never be put on us again. Therefore, this unitive knowledge is, in the true sense of the word, liberation (*mokṣa*).

## 6. Male-Female Relationship.

Modern science has taught us that even the smallest living cell is a highly complex, holistically organized unity of many specialized molecular protein subunits. These parts in the organized whole are not at all static or fixed in constitution and position but are in constantly stucturalizing and destructuralizing motion. This bidynamic, anabolic-katabolic ratio of cells and of organisms of cells determines the balance for viability. Recent researches in the biochemistry of cells have shown the energy reserves stored in a cell become anabolically worked over into the living protein structures of the cells before they become katabolically broken down for energy release in work. The imbalance either way is detrimental to life unless counterbalanced by exchange with other cells. Every living cell is continuously, more or less rapidly katabolically self-consuming and must acquire and build into its life quantiative ratios of special anabolic properties in order to counterbalance the ratio of its special form of katabolism. This law of motion and conservation of energy applies to all form of life, whether they are cell units or multicellular unities. Since the bisexual differentiation of an organism is already latent in a single cell's bidynamics it is safe to assume that, in the same way as a living cell anabolically deficient in any way is chemically driven to work repetitiously to acquire and anabolize adequate quantities of right qualities of nutritional substances, an individual which is either predominantly male or female is driven to seek the complementary opposite type. In other words, every bisexually differentiated individual is incompletely balanced and is forced to restore his internal with external equilibration and the counterbalancing bidynamic organization of his integrity as a whole. A man will seek the woman as will a woman the man. Such selective deficiencies or needs and cravings prove that every partial aspect is in want of its complement. In most cases this adjustment is sought on the biological level. We all know these hypersexual males and females who apparently feel completely satisfied with the sexual intercourse. We also know that the attitudinal and social differentiation is manifest in repetitious convulsive emotivations and that the social bisexual differentiation may be productive of a serious neurosis, because the one-sided biological determination of man is antagonistic with his spiritual destination. We may speak of a bidynamic differentiation in the energy for self-determination against oppositions; of a bisexual differentiation in the chromosomal-genic organization which determines the degree of bisexual differentiation of the gonads; of the ratio, quantity, and extent of gonadal hormonal secretion which differentiates the growth of the bisexual gonoducts, external genitals, and other somatic organs; of the conditioning bisexual social pressure of approvals and disapprovals as regards masculine dominance and female submissiveness in mating behavior, in all cases we state but in other words that there is a deeply felt need for equilibration. However, it will not do to perpetuate this apparent dualism into all eternity. This dualism is the cause of all the worries, all the miseries, all the conflicts that are going on in this world. Man must be remade. The remaking of man consists in regaining the integrity veiled only by the contraries. Since we as human beings are either men or women there is no better way of speaking of this integrity of man than by the symbol of the constant union of man and woman. The word symbol denotes that we have not to deal with the biological aspect exclusively. It means that nature and spirit are basically one and that only thus we can get a glimpse of the blissful unity. The importance and the necessity of uniting what seems to be separate have been expressed by Kāṇha in the following beautiful verses;

---

[1] Advayavajra, Mahāsukhaprakāśa :

*prajñopāyātmyakaṁ tattvaṁ bāhyābhyantaraśuddhitaḥ*
*buddhvā samâsato mantrī sukhito 'sthânayogataḥ*

*asthânayoga*: There is no need to artificially set up conditions favourable to one's actions.

> "How can enlightenment be attained in this bodily existence without thine incessant love, oh lovely young girl?"[1]
>
> "He who has made his jewel-like mind unswerving by taking his proper spouse, is the Vajranâtha (i. e. the adamantine and indestructible man). I have spoken of the highest nature of man (or: of ultimate truth)".[2]

---

[1] Kāṇha 29 cd:

*to biṇu taruṇi / nirantara nehe*
*bohi ki lâbhaī eṇa bi dehe*

[2] Kāṇha 31:

*jē kia niccala maṇa-rayaṇa nia ghariṇī laī etiha*
*so ho Bâjira ṇâhu re mayī butta parmattha*

> "In the same way as salt dissolves in water, so also the spirit that takes its proper spouse (transcends all boundaries). It penetrates into the essential, emotional moving unity (*samarasa*) (of what seems to be separate and distinct), if it is constantly united with her".[1]

Owing to the constant intermeshing and overlapping of instinctivity and spirituality, owing to the fact that a drive may be looked upon either with reference to its objective or with reference to its symbolic meaning, it is not to be wondered at that the erotic terminology plays an important role. All that is represented in this process of attaining one's highest aim is born out of the partly spiritual and partly instinctive factor. The tremendous energy stored up in it seeks an outlet in one way or another, At the same time, however, it shows that man's aim cannot be thought of as a stress on the one side or the other. Man will not find himself when he becomes a slave to mere instinctivity or when he loses his ground under his feet while striving to possess mere spirituality. He will find his integrity when he succeeds in living instinctivity and spirituality together on a new level, when his whole nature is raised to its fullness, its maximum expression. Though the relation between the two is inconceivable by us from the logical standpoint, it is got over when we have the direct apprehension of reality. Therefore, nothing has been achieved when we believe in the basic unity of instinctivity and spirituality; they continue acting as an unreconciled duality. We must find out the truth of our own highest and inmost existence and live it without following any outer standard.

---

[1] **Kâṇha 32**:
*jima lôṇa bilijjai pāṇiehi tima ghariṇī lai citta*
*samarasa jaī ṭakkhaṇe jai puṇu te sama ṇitta*

The man of the world is lost in the varied activities of the world and follows his drives; the quietist withdraws from the world in order to develop a sort of private world into which others cannot enter. But the ideal man goes beyond these extremes.

To a certain extent the striving for integrity and balance may be compared with the mating behaviour of single cells. When they are internally incompletely balanced or lacking in adequate quantities of anabolic, resp. katabolic substances to carry on the work of living, they have selective and acquisitive mating craving needs for complementary opposite types and avoidant compulsions for like and misfit types. In other words, mating behaviour is produced by a deficiency of anabolism or katabolism in a cell exciting chemical affinities, sensitivities, and motivities for union with another cell that has complementary opposite ratios of counterbalancing properties. The anabolic-katabolic re-equilibration, brought about either through ingesting other cells, or through graded repeated exchanges between living cells of fitting quantities and qualities of nutritional substances, or through conjugation between two cells, is equal to a renewed viability. In the same way as the fusion of cells in the biological field results in a rejuvenescent viability so also the re-equilibration or fusion of what we call manness and femaleness has the same effect in an individual. Therefore Tilopa says of this new state beyond the contraries:

"When the (intuitive) knowledge of (the unity of) Bliss and Wisdom, which is without (worldly) attachment, rises, man's viability is increased; his hair will not become white; and he will grow like the waxing moon".[1]

---

[1] Tilopa, Mahāmudrā-upadeśa:
*de-la zen-med bde-stoṅ ye-śes ḥchar*
*tshe-riṅ skra-dkar-med-ciṅ zla-ltar rg as*

This verse shows that the material and the mental are but views of the same object by different methods, abstractions, pictures obtained by our reason from the indivisible unity of our being. The antithesis of matter and mind represents merely the opposition of two kinds of techniques. There is no reason to give to one a greater value than to the other. The bisexual differentiation found in matter is exactly in the same way but a picture of processes going on in the tissues of our body as is the bisexual differentiation of mind to be discussed in the following paragraphs. It was the error of Descartes to believe in the reality of these abstractions and pictures and to consider the material and the mental as two different things. This dualism has weighed heavily upon the history of our knowledge of man. It has engendered the false problem of the relation of the soul and the body. There is no such relation. Neither the soul nor the body can be investigated separately. Equally neither man nor woman exist for themselves. If this were the case a man would not care for a woman, nor a woman for a man. Man and woman, maleness and femaleness, are but another arbitrarily made division.

Man seeks his counterpart, the woman, but this part is also lying hidden within himself. Since everything that is met with in life is but a picture the fact that the union of the contraries, of maleness and femaleness, is illustrated by pictures from the biological realm should make us realize that this physiological picture is, at the same time else the symbolic expression for the union of the contraries on the spiritual level. While for him who has attributed a greater reality to matter than to mind the union of the contraries seems to be achieved by sexual intercourse, to him who attributes a greater reality to mind this union is apparently brought about by the integration of his own inherent, hidden femaleness. In this way we have a double pair of contraries, an inner one and an outer one. But it will not do to give a privileged position to one aspect or another ; the contraries should be examined in the converging light of physiology and psychology.

Whenever man comes into contact with his counterpart, which is a certain aspect of life not lived by the individual and excluded from his conscious attitude, whenever a man comes into contact with his latent femaleness or a woman with her hidden maleness, thus giving up the one-sidedness of conscious life, their whole being will be enriched. This enrichment is of utmost importance for the whole future life. We may say that what on the biological level is represented as sexual intercourse is on the mental level the union or fusion of consciousness with the unconscious. Only an individual's consciousness is linked up with the visible physical sex, while the opposite aspect is latent in the unconscious the integration of which is essential for the fullness of life. Man consists of all his actual and potential activities. The functions which, at certain epochs and in certain environments, remain virtual, are as real as those which constantly express themselves. Consciousness is not the whole man. Life that will be enriched by the integration of what formerly has been excluded from is only possible if man is not only content with knowing about his latent opposite aspect but if he also is ready to accept everything that has been spurned and repressed for "moral" and other conventional reasons. However, if he continues to debase, to despise, and even to hate his opposite aspect, he will not grow up to fullness of life ; he will never experience what happiness and what transport may be given to his life by the acceptance of what has been arbitrarily banished into darkness. Accepting and integrating the opposite aspect means to develop all potentialities. At the same time it also rescues the individual from the state of intellectual, moral, and physiological atrophy brought about by the one-sided conditions of contemporary life. It also creates an inner warmth that is totally wanting in the egocentric confinement to the sphere of rationality and respectability. It makes man one with the glories of the spirit. When there is this unique love which cares for everything, however small and insignificant it may appear to our reasoning intellect, the individual will be no longer preoccupied with brutally changing those factors that enter his life, with reforming them, punishing them, protecting himself against their interference, either by forestalling or by crushing them. The whole net of intriguing concepts that intervenes between him and his opposite and makes true knowledge and respect of the other impossible will vanish into thin air. Nothing remains that might dim his view. The pure light of his very own nature spreads over all and everything. The individual experiences an inner awareness which is superior to his egocentric consciousness, because it is more than the ego-inflicted narrow compass of his vision. Man has risen above the contraries. He has become what he has been from the very beginning. Therefore, Sahara says:

> "Do not create duality, create unity. Do not set up conceptual opposites within this state of (unitive and all-comprehensive) awareness. Immerse all the three worlds in a single light (*ekku karu baṇṇa*) through true love ("*mahārāē*").[1]

---

[1] Saraha 28:
*ekku karu [re mā karu benni jāne na karaha biṇṇa*
*ehu tihuaṇa saala mahārāē ekku karu baṇṇa]*

As long as this transcendental state has not been realized the relation between man and woman, maleness and femaleness, appears in two different aspects. The one is an internal process of integration between consciousness and the unconscious, the other one is an external frame of reference. But the one cannot be without the other. Therefore, the whole problem becomes most complicated. Sometimes it is impossible to decide which aspect is dominant.

Since the specific inner nature of femininity is obscure to the male, as is the specific inner of masculinity to the female, and since in accordance with their physical development and function in society the male feels subjectively as a male and the female as a female, on account of the fact that the male is not able to satisfy his femininity—nor the woman her masculinity—the tendencies and features of the opposite sex appear, normally, extrajected and give rise to longing for the other sex. Now, whenever an individual establishes a rapport with a member of the opposite sex due to extrajection, we have to distinguish between objectivation, that is, actual traits of an extraject (i.e. the object representation which emerges from extrajection) are found in an outer object, and the incorrect imputation of traits and qualities of an extraject as well as desires to an external object. The contents of these imputations may be due either to memory traces of object images or to a "hallucinated image", that is, to a fantasy image that need not necessarily be the image of a remembered object. All these factors determine what one "sees" in an object. Not infrequently there will be some difficulty in determining the relative degree of correct perception and incorrect imputation. In other words, since both the internal and the external world are equally real and active, the external object meets the qualities of the extraject to a certain degree, but it would be erroneous to consider the external object as just a lifeless clothes-peg to hang one's extrajects on. The external object has a life of its own. Owing to the constant intermeshing and overlapping of the external and the internal the fascinating influence of the woman on the man should be considered as an inducement to come into contact with what is operating within the individual himself. However, love for persons of the other sex as well as for the specific inner nature of femininity or masculinity presupposes an understanding of the specific features of the love object. If, in a male, "femininity" is not sufficiently developed or if it is repressed, he will not be able to understand the woman and her specific nature. He will become more or less intolerant. Instead of longing for a tender, receptive, affectionate, and emotionally responsive being, he will despise the weakness, emotionality, awkwardness, and whimsicality of the "woman". It should be borne in mind, however, that the "woman" appears to him in this way only, because his own femininity has remained undeveloped. Therefore the individual's emotional attitude towards his opposite will depend upon the nature of the objectivated extraject. A positive affective attitude will determine love for the object; a negative affective attitude, hate. The occidental conviction that life for good or evil is determined by the without, and the almost incurable habit of concretizing any internal content and of placing it into an outer world or an outer object makes the split between masculinity and femininity still greater. It makes most men concentrate their whole interest in women on sexuality, but their sexual longing occurs at the expense of interest in and understanding of the feminine nature. They are unable to enter into a full mental relationship. The brutality involved in so many actions on the part of man are basically attributable to this continuing and ever-expanding externalization. Socially conditioned prejudices and the overgrown fear of deviation from the fortuitous standards of tradition make it extremely difficult to come to an understanding of what goes on within ourselves. This fear must not be underestimated. We speak of development, but, as a matter of fact, we are constantly engaged in keeping something from developing. The case of moral decisions is much more a case of keeping the evil motive from becoming realized than of realizing the good motive. The same aspect we find in man's moral life is also presented in the treatment of expression of emotions. Because society disapproves, we do not want to have emotions and try to get rid of the less desirable emotions All our actions are more in the direction of checking undesired forms of expression than of encouraging new desirable forms. Our efforts consist in creating a vacuum into which the so-called good pours in. The host of phenomena like frustration, regression, infantilism, inferiority complex, rationalization, extrajection, defense mechanisms, and so on, bears telling witness to the intensity of the fight in which we are engaged. The strain of our mental life is the common result of all these factors. The most violent battle, however, is fought against imagination. How far a cry it is from the devotion of a small child to a world of imagination, a devotion so somplete that the imagined world is the real world to the child, to the suspicion of the adult. Again he destroys, he does not develop, because he thinks that the world of imagination will sap his strength in the struggle with the hard facts of his outer world. The world of the ego is a world of destruction, it is not a world of development. Although we are acquiring more and more knowledge about what our society requires, we do not develop. All change refers to the exterior expression only. True development would shake and undermine the one-sided, rationalistic world. Our inertia makes us remain static and averse to development. The inevitable result is fanaticism, in order to keep up our self-deception. If ever we want to develop we have to reject all systems, to break down all the artificial fences erected by the intellect and its rationalization, which may be boldly defined as self-deception by reasoning, because most of the "reasons" we give ourselves and others are not the genuine causes of our conduct but are the excuses which we imagine to be acceptable to ourselves as well as to others. Man only develops when inspired by a high aim, when contemplating vast horizons. The sacrifice of our petty and much cherished ego is not very difficult for us when we burn with passion for a great adventure. And there is no more sublime and dangerous adventure than the renovation and remaking of man. It is correct to speak of a dangerous adventure, because no one knows what lies behind the walls of the ego. The hidden potentialities may destroy the individual. In the case of the relationship of masculinity and femininity they may lead to a hopeless disturbance of life by unnatural sexualization. On the other hand, they may open up new possibilities for life and lead to the realizaton of the highest aim. The inner nature of femininity which is obscure to the conscious attitude of the male may give man information about things which, as a rule, lie beyond his limited vision.

In the same way as man's outer world, society, induces him to identify himself with the functions and roles he is expected to play in society so also he is at the mercy of the influences of his inner world, the covert world of imagination and thought. He who in his external life is the representation of the ideal "virile" male is compensated by feminine weakness from within. He is under the influences of all sorts of moods, affects, and other compulsive notions. But while it is relatively easy to distinguish between what society expects from us and what we appear to ourselves as well as to others, it is extremely difficult to make this distinction between ourselves and what is operating within us. We have become accustomed to identify ourselves with our thoughts and emotions, so that we are more or less convinced of the fact that we have created these thoughts and emotions all by ourselves. Very often we feel the greatest responsibility for the queerest notions. It is a severe blow to the prestige of our ego to acknowledge the fact that our cherished ego is but the speaking-tube of these ideas and not their creator. However, whatever may be the case, if the individual identifies himself with his function in society or with the ideas that are forced upon him by the within, in either case the human being turns altogether into a facade; he becomes bidimensional and shadow-like, as it were. The conflict between the within and the without is not solved by giving oneself up to either side. It will be solved when both the within and the without is taken into account. It will not do to overestimate "masculine" characteristics or to fall a prey to the undeveloped "feminine" traits. Both aspects must be transcended. Only then man's true nature will burst forth in radiant splendour.

Whenever a man and a woman unite, whenever masculinity and femininity meet, both are altered.

Everyone takes upon himself the qualities of the other and shares them with him. For this reason, everyone is in a dangerous situation, because the effects of the one on the other can be very far-reaching, especially, when there is a latent disposition to admit this induction current into oneself. As a matter of fact, this disposition is always present, without it no one would care for the other. Because of the fact that a man is "interested" in a woman he exposes himself to her influences, although in most cases he will not admit this fact out of fear that he may lose his prestige. It is, however, an undeniable fact that man must be interested in women, because his whole system, if I may say so, presupposes *the* woman and is in want of her. Since the relationship between masculinity and femininity becomes manifest on various levels we have a most complicated problem on hand. The desire to deal with simple facts creates the temptation to select one aspect or another and to "explain" it as a "nothing-but". It should be borne in mind, however, that most of our explanations are but excuses for phenomena we have not understood. The activity behind the manifest content of any movement is more complicated and influential than everything else. The most powerful drives to action lie deeply embedded below *the* limen of consciousness and the conscious motives expressed by the individual are, as a matter of fact, often but distorted versions of underlying unconscious ones. It is true, the sexual aspect is very rarely missing in this process of achieving the union of the contraries. Therefore it is so very easy to believe that the erotic performance, so fascinating in itself, is the main objective. The more the individual gives vent to the drive with reference to its objective, the more he will be inclined to think that the physiological satiation of the drive is the only truth. Moreover, sexuality as an apparently common experience having the same aim strengthens the feeling of complete union and unity. It is the experience of a superior power which obliterates all distinctive marks and does away with the dissociation between the unconscious and consciousness. Consciousness is only aware of individually acquired contents, it does not know anything about the creative power of the unconscious, but at this moment of rapture it seems to be filled with a sense of fulfilment.

Sexual partnership seems to be the best expression for the most intimate relation between two opposites and for a subtle awareness of harmony. But it must be remembered that in the consummation of the sexual act man has succumbed to a powerful drive, he has not become master of himself. He has not realized the basic unity of maleness and femaleness. The conflict between these two forces has only temporarily subsided. It will worry man again. The essential fact is to experience this basic unity and never to lose it again. This lasting experience can certainly not be achieved by the satiation of a sudden biological urge. The realization and the experience of the basic unity is very like sexual fulfilment. Therefore, sexuality is to be understood as a picture or a symbol, but not as a reality per se.

Since the contraries are but the two aspects of the One, since they are but the superficies, it is not only possible but also necessary to go behind them. If you want to get a precious pearl you must dive deep, you will not get it just by floating on the surface. The adherents of Buddhist Tantrism were both the experimenters and philosophers of this profound problem of the union of the contraries. Like other Indian philosophers they lived what they taught.. Unlike most philosophers in the Western hemisphere they did not seek brilliancy or solemnity in marshalling thoughts and building up ephemeral philosophical systems or promulgating suferficial and unfounded ideas as to "how the world might be improved". They dispensed with the eclat which attaches to all such contrivances, finally ending in universal bullying. They also knew that the material and the mental are one and the same process. There is no parallelism between matter and mind. This uniformity of material and mental processes is borne out by their terminology itself. The terms may be understood in an "objective" sense and in a "symbolic" sense at the same time. For this reason it is almost impossible to translate Tantric texts. Nevertheless, after all what I have said, I hope that the reader will divine something of what lies behind the "objective", manifest sense.

"Soon after he has embraced his female partner (*mudrā*), inserted his male organ into her vulva (*vajrāveśapravartana*), drinks from her lips sprinkled with milk, makes her speak cooingly, enjoys rich delight, and makes her thighs quiver, King Cupid, (man's) adamantine nature (*vajrasattva*), will become manifest.

"But he must proceed in such a way that his mind does not swerve, for when his jewel-like mind swerves (from this transcendental unity and relapses into the contraries conditioning each other), perfection will never be accomplished".[1]

---

[1] Prajñopāyaviniścayasiddhi 38-40

In another place we read:

"Having performed the union (of the adepts) with his female partner (*mudrā*) the most gracious teacher shall let (the student) insert his male organ (*bodhicitta*) into her vulva (*padmabhāṇḍa*) which is the place (of birth) of the Victorious Ones (*jinālaya*)".[1]

The Occidental mind may be a little shocked. Such words seem to be on a level with the idiom of the public water-closet. The Western mind is so very much inhibited as to the expression of the wonder and glory of sexual experience, because on account of his negative activity he has repressed the drives and created moral foulness. Moreover, he is not able to see the unity of drive and spirit because of his nothingbutism. Therefore he tries either to sexualize spirituality or to "spiritualize" sexuality. But in reality his spiritualization is foul romanticism. For him everything that is connected with sexuality is distorted by the fever of lust. The healthy-mindedness of Hindu and Buddhist religious sentiment is a reflection of minds free from neurotic conflicts about sex. Their direct attitude towards sex enables them to project on the whole cosmos the halo of satisfied sexuality, as is to be seen from the intricate embraces of divine couples depicted in temple carvings and paintings. If there still should be some doubts as to the fact that more is meant than a spiritless and stupid "nothing—but," I should like to draw the reader's attention to the fact that all such words as *mudrā* ("female partner", "man's inner feminine nature"), *vajra* ("male organ", "man's indestructible nature"), *bodhicitta* ("enlightenment", "attitude directed towards enlightenment", "energetic flow"), are only used when the texts speak of the reorientation of man. These words are not so much attempts to answer the riddle of man and the universe, they are attempts to describe what sages have discovered by self-exploration. They are verbalizations of intense emotional experiences and are frankly presented as such. They are a sort of religious pidgin to express what has been felt, because normal language is inadequate.

---

[1] Prajñopāyaviniścayasiddhi III 20

In spite of these facts someone might be of opinion that the problem at hand is mainly one of the actual relation between a man and a woman. This opinion is strengthened by the prejudice that only concrete facts count in life—facts for which a confirmation by experiments or tests can be postulated. It is certainly correct to speak of an actual relation between a man and a woman, but this relation must not be thought of as a merely personal adjustment. Its roots lie deeper and transcend the frontiers of the limited personal world. As I have pointed out before, to a certain extent the woman represents the unknown feminine nature of the male and, therefore, is a frame of reference for the facts of both the outer and the inner world. Furthermore, the woman also takes part in this process of reorientation and refashioning of one's personality, which term, of course, must not be understood in the sense of the hackneyed phrase "having a good time". or "expressing one's personality". The woman's psychology is different from the male's. In the same way as a man can only extraject his feminine nature, because his masculinity is, normally, linked up with his conscious attitude, as also the woman can only extraject her latent masculinity and objectivate it in a man. This results in a curious cross-relationship of the sex characters. On the mental level the male is represented by the female, as is the female by the male. This is ample evidence for the fact that the union of maleness and femaleness is not just a passing love affair of two individuals. This makes the problem still more complicated. There can be a personal relationship, but there can be also a relation of the man to his femininity as well as one of the woman to her masculinity, and also a relation between the two mental factors. Finally the fact must be mentioned that sometimes a man takes on a feminine role, identifying himself with his mother or some other woman, and since his ego feels as a female, the woman as a love object is obliterated. His relation to members of the opposite sex is characterized by an absence of interest in women. He is effeminate and very often extrajects his masculinity. Needless to say that all these relationships can appear conjointly in an individual. The multiplicity of the manifestations of maleness and femaleness makes both the male and the female display all sorts of human and superhuman qualities. Now they will appear in the disguise of a transcendental figure, now they will appear as hidden in the body of the adept. This interplay of maleness and femaleness seems te me to be hinted at in the following verses by Indrabhūti :

"He must not despise a woman, even if all her limbs are attacked by leprosy. Regardless of what standing she is, he may adore any woman when she is in possession of the Vajra ( *vajradhāriṇīṁ* )".

"Being in a state where thought-constructions are no longer made (*nirvikalpavidhisthitaḥ*), for the sake of attaining perfection he may approach a girl who has not yet had her menstruation but who is in possession of the Bodhicitta ( *bodhicittasamanvitāṁ*)".[1]

Both these terms, *vajra* and *bodhicitta*, which for obvious reasons I have not rendered into English, are synonymous. This is borne out by the words of Indrabhûti : "*bodhicitta* ( enlightenment ) accompanied by the infiniteness of Great Compassion ( *mahākaruṇā* ) for all beings is *vajra* ( the indestructible )".[1]

---

[1] Jñānasiddhi I 80-81

Similarly Anańgavajra speaks of this interplay of human and superhuman qualities :—

> "Since he is enlightenment by nature ( *bodhicittasvarūpataḥ* ), he is the true nature of all that exists; he is the Lord, the Indestructible Ono ( *bhagavān vajrī* ). Therefore he himself ( *ātmaiva* ) is the Deity".)[2]

These statements point to an important factor which is essential for an understanding of what is meant by the integration of maleness and femaleness into an indivisible whole. Great Compassion (*mahākaruṇā*) is the means or the method (*upāya*) by which man's highest aim may be realized. Method is thought of as the male aspect of the One. Psychologically speaking, it corresponds to the desire and to the resolve to be active in this world and to work for the salvation of all sentient beings. Great Compassion of ths nature of intense love, as has been pointed out by Anangavajra :

> "It removes (*rañjati*) all sufferings which spring up from inumerous causes, from all sentient beings ;
> Therefore compassion is called intense love (*rāga*)".[3]

In this way it stretches into our phenomenal world, into the universe, for the object of your love is the whole universe. But at the same time it stretches beyond the phenomenal world, because it is not for anybody or anything, but is a part of the nature of enlightenment (*bodhi*). By method, therefore, the extreme view that Nirvāṇa is eternal passiveness is avoided. Nirvāṇa is not passivity or tranquillity. Life is always in motion, never at a standstill. To seek tranquillity or to run away from life is to kill it, to stop its pulsation, to embrace a dead corpse. There is nothing in this to love. However, every action of man would go astray if it had not a meaning. The meaning of an action must not be confused with a purpose. It has nothing to do with utilitarian considerations. The one thing that hampers our life is the idea of purposeness, which the human intellect reads into all forms of movement. The concept of purposeness is alright as far as our economic, intellectual, political, and terrestrial existence is concerned. But we never feel completely satisfied with our achievements in these fields of mundane life. Our existence means far more than all these utilitarian considerations. We seek for something that goes far deeper than being merely economic, political, and intellectual. When we are conscious of any purpose in our movements we are not free, we are disturbed by all sorts of things, and not being free is the cause of all our worries. Purposelessness of action is the true meaning of Method. Therefore I said that it is not for anybody or anything.

---

[1] Jñānasiddhi, p. 76: *sarvasattveṣu mahākaruṇāpramāṇānugataṁ bodhicittaṁ vajra ity arthaḥ.*

[2] Prajñopāyaviniścayasiddhi V 33 :
*sarvabhāvasvabhāvo 'yaṁ bodhicittasvarūpataḥ*
*sa eva bhagavān vajrī tasmād âtmaiva devatā*

[3] Prajñopāyaviniścayasiddhi I 15.

The meaning of our actions is not what our rationalizing intellect reads into them. It is something that cannot be better termed than wisdom (*prajñā*). Like activity wisdom extends into our phenomenal world, and yet is of transcendental nature. Activity inspired by wisdom will not "improve" the world by dubious means. Wisdom teaches us to handle facts as facts and to do away with our imputations. Therefore it removes all obstacles we put up between ourselves and life, for life is simple enough, only when surveyed by the intellect it presents to the analyzing mind a picture of unparalled intricacies. Activity inspired by wisdom eradicates the other extreme view, the eternity of the world ( *saṁsāra*), which has its root in ignorance (*avidyā* ) Our ignorance, our inability to see things as they are, leads us firmly to believe in the pictures conjured up before our eyes as in realities per se. It makes us believe that we can alter things, as a matter of fact, we can only grow above them.

This emancipating wisdom which breaks our compulsive notions to pieces, is *śūnyatā*. Since this is born out of the One out of which activity or method is born, since it is the other aspect of the One, it is one with this indestructible nature of all being *vajra*. Therefore it has been said :

"Śûnyatā is called Vajra, because it is firm, sound, cannot be changed, cannot be pierced, cannot be split, cannot be burned, cannot be destroyed".[1]

Wisdom (*prajñā*) or *śūnyatā* is thought to be female. In the Hevajra it is described in allusion to the sexual as follows :

"Splitting means fissure ( *bhaga*, also vulva ), because the defllements ( of mind ), the Māras and so on, get smashed ( by it ). The defilements ( of mind ) are oppressed by wisdom ( so that they lose their strength and cease to disturb mind ). Therefore wisdom ( *prajñā* ) is called fissure ( *bhagocyate* )".[2]

---

[1] Advayavajra. p. 23, quoting the Vajraśekhara :
*dṛdhaṁ sāram asauśiryam acchedyābhedyalakṣaṇaṁ*
*adāhi avināśi ca śūnyatā vajram ucyate*

[2] Sekoddeśaṭīkā, p. 3. Quotation from the Hevajra :
*bhañjanaṁ bhagam ākhyātaṁ kleśamārādibhañjanāt*
*prajñābādhyāś ca te kleśās tasmāt prajñā bhagocyate*

Now what is the meaning of *śūnyatā* ? The literal translation is "emptiness, voidness"[1]. However, this emptiness has nothing to do with nihilism which the Western mind likes to foster on Buddhism, for Buddhism is a hard nut to crack. It cannot be reduced to the rationalizations and confusions of a weak-minded Western intellectualist. The woolliness of modern myth, science, is incapable of grasping the Buddhist ideas, because it is immersed in a world created by the sciences of inert matter without any respect for the qualitative. The modern myth is born from the error of our reason and from the ignorance of our true nature. Buddhism, unlike Christianity, is not a religion of revealed truth but of truths—truths which by their very plurality are but suggestive guideposts to the discovery of man's true nature, not unbreakable rules for salvation. It is true, śūnyatā appears to the superficial mind as nothingness, because it is nothing to which we could apply the rigid laws of our reason, the systematic ideologies which often come perilously close to those that flourish among the paranoid cases in our insane asylums. *Śūnyatā* is not nothingness, not emptiness. It is not negation and withdrawal from reality. It is emptiness of illusion. And illusion does not mean the illusion of perception but the false conclusions we base upon perception. It is the superstition of permanency which we develop about in permanent things, the illusion of immutability we have about changing things, the illusion of possession we create about things that are only given us for use. It is the illusion of life and immortality which makes it so difficult for us to accept the reality of death, and it is the illusion of death which makes us wear guns with which we shoot our neighbour or kill whole nations, because we think that they are death in disguise. It is the illusion of the ego, which makes us believe to be more important than another.

---

[1] This term is often translated by "unsubstantiality". Now, this term is no operational concept. It is a left-over from the materialistic thinking of a past age. The problem of substance or non-substance is no psychological problem at all.

Great Compassion ( *mahākaruṇā* ) or disengaged activity ( *upāya* ) and wisdom ( *prajñā* ) or *śūnyatā,* the one as the male aspect and the other as the female aspect, are both together the blissful sense of peace and freedom which fills the mind when it is emptied from all attachment to illusion; it is the realization of resolved conflicts, of attained integration. It is the very reverse of the disintegrated and dissociated state of life in which the sophisticated Western world gives regular lessons every day.

The commingling of Great Compassion and wisdom is the totality felt by the whole. It is highest affirmation: it is the light by which one sees, not a light that one sees. All that has to be done in order to achieve this reunion of what once became separated is to be understood more as a technique of orientation than as a statement of mission. Carried over into practical life this activity makes for mutual tolerance and for understanding each one's nature. It makes man respect his fellow-men. It does not resort to the dubious means of cracking skulls. It makes man realize what he actually is. But this realization of his nature has nothing to do with the fictitious values of the ego, which always take on an authoritative character and become defenders of slavery. The integration of maleness and femaleness deepens the awareness of emotional satisfaction arising from participation. In this respect enlightenment is of highly social value. The enlightened man, who has achieved the integration and refashioned his personality, will not engage in good works in the Christian sense (based on mercantilism : "And when thou dost alms let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doth. That thy alms may be in secret : and thy Father who seeth in secret will repay thee",)[1] which is a somewhat circumstantial version of "what do you get out of that business"), but his instruction of his disciples constitutes in itself a most valid social activity.

When an individual arrives at this goal of the realization of the inseparability of maleness and femaleness, at enlightenment, then there are no fictitious contraries. He has found again what he has been from the very beginning. All his worries resulting from the exaggerations of his ego have ended.

"If I speak of the Ultimate, (you must know) that there is neither an Ego nor a Thou. Experience your inmost nature in that blissful state of what you are (in this state which we call) the fourth moment".)[2]

## The Cult of Women—The Cult of the Soul.

As I have already pointed out in the preceding chapter, the relationship between maleness and femaleness manifests itself in a double aspect. The one is an internal, subjective process of integration, a re-equilibration of our covert world of thoughts, feelings, and imagination. Through it both the conscious and the unconscious aspects of our soul are to be united and harmonized on a new level. The word soul is used here in a sense quite different from the Western conception. By it I do not understand a

---

[1] St. Matthew VI 3-4.

[2] Saraha 98 :

*ghaṁbhīraha ubāharaṇe naü para ṇaü appâṇā*
*sahajānande caüṭhṭha khaṇe ṇia saṁbeaṇa jāṇa*

spiritualized conscious personality, which is but an accidental and ephemeral assemblage of influences. Soul comprises both consciousness and the unconscious. Although the concept of the unconscious has been much contested it will be recognized at once that there are many instances of conscious processes appearing in the stream of consciousness which are totally inexplicable in terms of any of the preceding conscious processes. The course of consciousness is always too seriously interrupted to be thought of as a continuum, and it is these very gaps that are filled by the unconscious. The unconscious is an operational concept, as is consciousness. We must only avoid making the classical error of believing in the concrete existence of the parts abstracted from man by our mind. The focus of man can be observed from within and from without. Seen from within, he is a soul; seen from without, he appears as the human body, our own, as well as that of our fellow creatures. Thus, man assumes two totally different aspects. For this reason, he has been looked upon as being made up of two parts, the body and the soul. But this definition of man is a meaningless proposition. An operational definition is given of man, when we consider him as an organism manifesting physicochemical, physiological, and psychological activities. The operational concepts which are equivalent to the operation or to the set of operations involved in their acquisition can only be legitimately used in the domain to which they belong. But the concepts appropriate to one level should not be mingled indiscriminately with those specific of another. At the level of the electronic, atomic, and molecular structures found in man's tissues, as well as in trees, stones, and other beings, the concepts of space-time continuum, mass, force, entropy, and the like are rightly used, and also those of osmotic tension, electric charge, ions, capillarity, diffusion, and permeability. At the level of material aggregates larger than molecules, the operational concepts of micella, dispersion, and flocculation may be used. When the molecules and their combinations have built up tissue cells, and when these cells have formed organs and organisms, such concepts as genes, chromosomes and the like must be added. They exist simultaneously with the physicochemical concepts, but they cannot be reduced to them. At the highest level of organization, in addition to all these concepts just mentioned, we encounter consciousness and the unconscious. The physicochemical and physicological concepts have become insufficient. And, what is more, at the psychological level, we have to replace quantitative concepts by qualitative ones. Instead of mass we have to speek of intensity. Psychological problems cannot be solved in terms of physiology, or quantum mechanics. The qualitative is as true and real as the qnantitative.

The inner process of re-equilibration consists in finding out how much has been cut off and disavowed and falsely imputed to an external object. It consists in recognizing that these imputations stem from one' s own inner being. However, it is absolutely useless to simply admit that such contents as have been extrajected and imputed to an object have their source within ourselves, because in this case they are not experienced at all as to their effectiveness. They are but meaningless abstractions, conscious rationalizations, which never assist man in retrieving his lost balance. But since there is no absolute separation between thoughts, feelings, and things, these contents will be experienced when they become manifest in the relation of an individual to his fellow-men and somehow disturb the gladness of participation in others, Life is not a play put on by a professional cast, it is the interaction of all men upon all men. This is the second aspect of an external, objective frame of reference. It is social participation and personal relationship. Inasmuch as an inner disequilibrium disturbs the outer relationship of individuals, so also outer insecurity creates inner worries. The one cannot be without the other ; the one is the symptom of the other.

In the same way as the process of integration may be looked at from these two angles of the within and the without, so also two typical dangers are waiting for man. The individual who stresses the inner aspect and attributes a greater reality to it than to the equally important outer aspect, may withdraw from the world of objects and, through daydreaming, develop a sham spirituality, while he who stresses the outer aspect may get lost in the standardized rules—mostly negative ones—of society and even lower his relationship to his fellow creatures. In other words, the individual either gets drowned in an image he has created of the woman as the nearest and most intimate object and of the world at large, or he wears himself out in unrestrained sexuality, because the woman is but an object to be enjoyed and because the world serves the only purpose of satiating his senses. Neither does running away from the world of objects nor getting absorbed in the objects mature in the growth of the individual. It will remain a failure. In either case the individual will become pasteurized, never to look vigorous again until the undertaker has started working on him with his beauty kit.

Owing to the lack of spirituality, to most men getting absorbed in the objects appears to be the lesser evil. Here, at least, he cannot lose his mind, because it is already lost, and the whole thing fits into the drive for power. It is, however, essential that man on his way toward his goal does not succumb to these dangers. He has to take care that neither the outer world nor the inner world becomes the dominating factor and casts its spell on him. As is well known, we only experience various manifestations, through our sense-apparatus from without, and through imagination from within. Each one of us is made up of a procession of phantoms, in the midst of which strides an ineffable reality. In the same way as it is impossible to state that the red colour is existent per se, because only under certain conditions we see something as red, so also that which comes to us from within in the form of a picture of imagination cannot be said to exist in itself. Both the within and the without are creations of our methods. We must be careful not to concretize the appearance and idolatrously to take the manifestion for the principle. In other words, the within is just as real or irreal as is the without. Owing to the overestimation of the without, to which arbitrarily a greater reality has been attributed, it is extremely difficult to forget, even for a moment, that the within is nothing but fantasy, a deplorable left-over from childhood, the consequence of afixation or a recrudescence of childish modes of thoughts in maturity. Fantasy or imagination is not created by us, it impresses itself upon us. In order to conceal the painful fact that our ego is not sole master of the house, and in order to inspire ourselves with courage we have become accustomed to say : "I have done it", "I have this tendency". Therefore, whatever we experience from within is a reality and must be taken seriously. It only appears as something created. Thus, even if one adhered to the strictly materialistic point of view that there is no objective reality in the products of imagination, it is not possible to consider them as meaningless abstractions. They have at least the meaning that imaginary numbers have in mathematics—the meaning of furthering operations with real numbers. Creative imagination alone is capable of inspiring conjectures and dreams pregnant with the worlds of the future. In order to apprehend the inner world we have to divide it into parts. Their limits may be convenient, but they are artificial. This inner world ceaselessly modifies its form, its quality, and its intensity. It may be compared to an ameba whose multiple and transitory limbs, the pseudopods, consist of a single substance, and in the same way as the pseudopods of the ameba are the ameba itself, so also the various aspects of the inner world of man are man himself. The various aspects make one another relative. There is not the faintest vestige of absolute reality in either consciousness or the unconscious. However, it is readily conceded that the unconscious is relative, but we are averse to admitting that consciousness, too, is relative, That would shake our foundations; that would mean to doubt the supremacy of consciousness. At once we would feel panic-stricken, for our conscious world, thought to be "real", is endangered by a fantastic "irreal" world. However, if man learns that both the within and the without are but manifestations of an invisible and ineffable reality, that they are carved by his methods of observation from an indivisible whole, his eyes will be opened to a richer world. A world which, although enclosed within himself, stretches beyond space and time. He will be able to transcend the phenomenal. He will reach the stage of unitive life. In this way the artefacts of subject and object, of consciousness and the unconscious, as well as of the other contraries will vanish, for they exerted their power and held man spellbound as long as his attitude was biased, as long as he unduly emphasized the one aspect and underrated the other. This piercing through the veil of the phenomenal is the first step to enlightenment, to knowledge. But for many people it is a tremendously hard task to learn that their one-sided conscious world is not absolutely real, but only as real or irreal as their dream world. In the midst of all manifestations strides reality which does not care if we call its manifestations names. For the occidental mind it is a painful task to admit that the within is exactly as is the without. Therefore, we have to speak of the relativation of the without. Otherwise it will not be possible to open the Western man's eyes to the fact that whatever he experiences appears as an object, when concretized. For the Indian mind this relativation is unnecessary, because from the very beginning it was convinced of the fact that the within and the without were equally valid or invalid. For this reason, the Indian mind could treat the outer world and the inner world alike. "The (outer) world is no reality per se (*nirvastuko*), it is apprehended in exactly the same way as a veil or a dream".[1] From this transcendental point of view we are enabled to understand the simile of the woman who sees the birth and death of a son in a dream, and the comparison of this experience with that of enlightenment. No longer do we cling to the surface of appearances, we have gone to the source from whence these manifestations did spring.

"In the same way as a young woman, lying on her couch, (whilst dreaming) experiences the birth of a son, is glad when he is born, but is sorrowful when he dies, so also the sage apprehends all phenomena (as dream-like visions). That which the young woman experiences, is (as a matter of fact,) the unborn and uncreated, but it appears as born and created by her".[1]

---

[1] Sekoddeśaṭīkā, p. 49.

However, we must be careful not to confuse this relativation and depreciation of the outer world with some sort of fugue, because disagreeable experiences in life apparently have made it seem unendurable. On the contrary, the relativation of the outer world means the emancipation from artificial fetters. To become disentangled is equivalent to getting rid of the influences of the environment wherein man happens to be placed. And this environment may be an outer one, society, or an inner one, certain esthetic and moral rules. Just as we are handicapped in dealing with ethical problems so long as we hold to an absolute definition of morality, so we are handicapped in dealing with our fellow-men so long as we identify our local normalities, which are the statistically average, with the inevitable necessities of existence. The recognition of the relativity of the within and the without challenges customary opinions and causes those who have been bred to them acute discomfort, but we must be willing to take account of changes even when the question is of morality in which we were bred. When we recognize the fact that the within and the without are dazzling illusions erecting walls for keeping life outside, we shall be able to get rid of the superstition that one aspect is more important than the other. This alone makes way for tolerance and unitive knowledge. It brings to man the fulfillment of his highest desires, inner strength, spiritual light, ineffable peace. Thus Saraha exclaims:

"Do not stay at home (as a man entangled in the objects of this world`, do not go into the forest (as a psychic anchorite). In every place apprehend the (activity of the) spirit. Enlightenment is in everything. What is the meaning of world and of Nirvāṇa"?

---

[1] Sekoddeśaṭīkā, p. 49. Quotation from the Samādhirājasūtra.

"Enlightenment is to be found neither at home nor in the forest. In this way understand the difference. Realize the true nature of the immaculate spirit. It is completeness."

"A single seed produces two trees. Therefore the fruit is the same. He who knows that there is no difference, is liberated from the cycle of births (i. e. he is not entangled in the objective world) and from Nirvāṇa (i. e. he is not lost in alienation)."

"Cycle of births and Nirvāṇa are one and the same (i. e. they are the two aspects of the whole). Do not believe in any other distinction. Since I have rejected all distinctions as to the indivisible one, I have found it to be immaculate."[1]

The relativity of both the without and the within, which I have discussed here at length, is essential for understanding the close relationship between the cult of women and the cult of the soul. Man's relation to his inner world takes on the character of the cult of the soul. At the same time, the statement that

---

[1] Saraha 105, 106, 112, 104:

*gharahi ma thakku ma jāhi bane jahī tahī maṇā pariāṇa*
*saala nirantara bohi ṭhia kahī bhaba kahī nibbāṇa*
*naü ghare ṇaü banē bohi ṭhiu eba pariâṇaü bheu*
*nimmala-citta-sahābatta karaha abikkala seu*
*sa-bon gcig-la sdoṅ-po gñis*
*rgyu-mtshan de-las ḥbras-bu gcig*
*de yaṅ dbyer med gaṅ sems-pa*
*de ni ḥkhor daṅ mya-ṅan-ḥdas rnam gro*
*Jo bhaba so nibbâṇa khalu bhebu na maṇṇahu aṇṇa*
*ekka-sahābe bīrahia nimmala maï paḍibaṇṇa*

these manifestions are of relative validity makes it clear that neither of them can be a goal in itself. Man must grow above them. The problem to be discussed in this chapter is of utmost importance, because a similar problem was faced by the Western peoples during the Middle Ages. For reasons, which will be explained hereafter, this problem was made to take a wrong turn and, incidentally, bred horrible superstition as well as the degradation of men and women.

It is well known that in accordance with his psychological development and function in society, the male feels subjectively as a male and the female as a female. The aspect of the opposite sex does not undergo actual involution but operates in that realm which is excluded from male or female consciousness. It reveals itself mostly in secondary mental characters, biases, and drives. Inasmuch as man's inner feminity is recognized as indispensable for reaching the stage of unitive knowledge and life, so the outer position of women is changed, for the within and the without are not absolutes; they are constantly interacting upon each other.

Throughout the centuries powerful tendencies have been at work to ascribe to the male all sorts of superiority and to extol his logic-chopping mind to the skies, while, at the same time, the mind of the female and its orientation into a different direction were considered as a sign of inferiority. In this delusion there is another linkage and lapping of ideas, the ideas of sensuality and aggression, tempered and reinforced by the master-delusion of rightness. What the male seeks is, beside sensual pleasure and participation, the right to commit a social and psychological aggression, to become a slave-owner, temporarily at least. The sense of rightness is apt to be excessively authoritative. It confers quite a disproportionate merit on the man and makes disagreement a heinous crime. This nightmarish delusion has in course of time become rationalized and institutionalized. Therefore, it will be very difficult to get rid of this obstacle to human develepment and growth. Our mind is so constructed as to delight in simple facts, following the principle of minimum effort and of maximum pleasure. And the most simple thing is to believe in the rightness of institutionalized customs. We feel a kind of repugnance in attacking a difficult problem as that of the relation between man and woman and of the achievement of harmony. Even the spread of science has not purged us from this authoritative attitude. It has aggravated it, because the relative certainty of some scientific results has created the impression in our minds that the application of scientific methods automatically produces truths of scientific validity. But scientific truths are not immutable. They will be changed as soon as new and better methods are developed. But we must never forget that the intensity of the longing for the ultimate goal, whatever this may be, is more important and a much greater factor in life than the rightness of the methods.

Under certain conditions the tendency to debase the woman and to shun her as if she had the plague is intelligible. When an individual has lived all the time in a way that corresponds to objective conditions and their demands and when he has realized the peril of being attracted by the external objects or events to such a degree as to get totally lost in them, he is apt to denounce and to degrade these very objects. For this seems to be the only possible means to elude the attractive power of the outer world. At all times the relation of man to woman has been characterized by sensuality, in a narrower sense of the word, by sexuality. Of course, it is only natural that a man should concentrate on the role of going to bed with a woman ; it yields pleasure and is self-important, but it is also the very reason in the end that he knows so little about women. Since a man sees the woman through the extrajects of his own inner femininity he realizes how a woman looks at him in particular, but he never tries to find out how a woman looks at things in general. So, whatever a man has to say about the nature of a woman is distorted by his extrajects. The assumption that a woman is more exposed to sensuality than a man is just his fancy. A man is only interested in his own feelings, the ones a woman arouses in him. He calls that "knowing" the woman. Now, in Biblical terminology "knowing" is the word for lying with a woman. These two are usually mistaken for the same thing. Carnal knowledge, a meaty acquaintance, is about all there is as far as most men's knowing women goes. His selfishness does not allow him to "know" a woman at all. The woolliness and obliqueness of his sense of rightness then causes him to construe rigidly standardized types and to muddle things up. Since the specific inner nature of femininity is obscure to the male and hence appears to him only when extrajected and objectivated in a woman, and since this feminine nature is of inferior quality the more it has been excluded from and shunned by the dominant masculinity, an excellent testimony is given for the "truth" that it is not the man who is such an inferior being but the woman. Thus again he is right in punishing her and in protecting himself against her interference. Reformers and similar mentally unbalanced persons start from this delusion.

It is true, there are some passages in Buddhist texts in which it has been stated that women are unable to attain enlightenment, that being a male is better than being a woman. I mention only the following ones : "It is not possible, it cannot be that a woman becomes an Arhant, an Enlightened One. He knows that this is not possible. He knows, however, that a man becomes an Arhant, an Enlightened One. He knows that this is possible".[1] And, "All women may be reborn as men".[2] Such statements, however, have never been mixed up with a weak morality as have those of some depleted, psychologically inhibited Christian Fathers who exclaimed that every woman ought to be filled with shame at the thought that she is a woman, and, that married people ought to blush at the state in which they are living.[3] Moreover, these statements of the inferiority of women have been refuted by other passages in the Buddhist texts. The goal is beyond such secondary and unimportant considerations as maleness and femaleness.

"What is the meaning of femininity, if one's mind is well concentrated,

if knowlede is in him who has realized ultimate truth ? He who ponders over such problems as "Am I a woman, Am I a man, Am I something ?" may be addressed by Māra ( i. e. the temptation to identify oneself with some conceptual abstraction or other )".[4]

---

[1] Majjhima-Nikāya III 65.

[2] Śikṣāsamuccaya, p. 219.

[3] St. Ambrose, Exhortatio virginitatis, ed. Migne, vol. xvi, col. 346. Clement of Alexandria, Paedagogus, ed. Migne, series Graeca, vol. viii, col. 429. Tertullian, De cultu feminarum, even went so far as to state that the woman is the gate to hell. (ed. Migne, vol. i, col. 1305).

[4] Saṁyutta-Nikāya I 130.

Unlike totalitarian systems, which ignore the individual, only take account of human beings, believe in the reality of the Universals, and treat men as abstractions, Indian religiosity has avoided the error of the standardization of men. If we were all identical, we could be reared and made to live and work in herds, like cattle. All statements have been made during the instruction of the pupils by the Guru. Therefore it is absolutely necessary to know what sort of man that pupil was to whom such statements were made. Otherwise Indian statements will not be understood. Indian teachers are not book-minded. They do not prefer to study man on parchment rather than in the glorious original However, to enquire about the "who" and not about the "what" is a stumbling-block for occidental man. For he only hears, explains, and argues upon the assertions but deletes the subject who made and makes these assertions from the agenda. With him truth is absolute, finally and immutably revealed. But absolute truth is blab, just blab and nothing else. Because in his rigid, pre-arranged world all truth proceeds from God and all error from Satan, because truth is salvation and error damnation, and because damnation is damnable in itself, he contrives family trees for every fragment of truth or of error that he thinks he discovers. Every truth is the child of shining truth and will beget hosts of little truths; every error is the child of more basic error and—highly infectious, hence a community menace. Therefore, anyone who deviates from truth must be purged. Caesarean madness, which is inherent in every rigid system, is at its height. If we take into account the individual who has made these statements quoted above, as well as him to whom they were made, these assertions will take on different meaning. No longer do they claim universal validity or even infallibility, they only serve to cut off former emotional relationships to the world and to make way for new kinds of development. For this reason, also the following words which apparently purport to degrade the status of women and all that is connected with them, are meant to repudiate the naive conception that the spiritual world is but a copy of the physical world, a romanticized version at best:

> "Neither are there women nor is there sexual intercourse. As beings of a higher spiritual level, the followers of the Victorious One are sitting in the calyxes of lotus flowers."[1]

The degradation of the female sex, which first of all serves to cut off all emotional entanglements, to destroy the fetters by which the male is bound to the "objective" woman, is, at the same time, the cause of the cult of women, which means cult of the soul. If by this degradation the interest of the individual is shifted from the external object to the inner motives which aroused this interest, an equivalent to the objective reality is created in the inner realm of the individual. From this moment onward the outer object is no longer of decisive importance but the inner reality, which, in turn, creates a new frame of reference. Therefore, this whole problem has to be studied in the light of its historical and potential social context. For it is the story of every one of us, of all men in all ages, but most particularly of those men in those ages when social ideals are in bitter opposition to social practices. It is the story of a cataclysmic awakening. It is the story of becoming aware of one's own incredible potentialities, of appreciating some of the miracles of existence. It is true, this inner reality which superposes itself upon the outer reality distorts what is commonly called reality, but it enables man to see a little more than he would have seen otherwise. It demonstrates that the normal field of consciousness, busying itself with the without, is only an insignificant fraction of reality, of what man is capable of perceiving, and that no image of reality is whole which omits the concept of value. The shock of discovering that no object will ever yield unending pleasure, that ever and again it will thwart the hopes and ambitions of the subject, causes him to renounce the objective world and to seek relief in some other and strange realm. But when in course of time the individual learns that both the without and the within are abstractions of his mind he will find the way out of this dilemma. And when he learns that all holding to the one or the other is an aggravated conflict, when he feels that the temporary peace he has won by renouncing the object and clinging to the within is breathing spell to prepare for war, he will transcend the contraries, because now he fully knows that within and without are alluring creations of his mind.

---

[1] Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra, p. 373:
*na ca istriṇa tatra saṁbhavo*
*nâpi ca maithunadharma sarvaśaḥ*
*upapâduka te Jinorasâḥ*
*padmagarbheṣu niṣaṇṇa nirmalâḥ*

> "Without the turbulence (of the contraries), always remaining the same, such is the nature of man's inmost reality. Because all sorts of entanglements have been given up, there is neither vice nor virtue. Kāṇha has clearly stated so."[1]

Psychologically speaking, the shift of interest from

---

[1] Kāṇha 10:

*nitaraṅga sama sahaja-rūa saala-kaṡa-birahie*
*pâpa-puṇṇa rahie kuccha nāhi Kāṇhu phuḍa kahie*

the without to the within manifests itself as a reduction of consciousness and as an increase of imagination which so often has a visionary character. This transition from "fact-considering" thinking to "fantasy" thinking is often referred to as a regression to childhood, because it is usually childlike in that it corresponds both in character and intensity to the emotional moods of childhood. Whether this "fantasy thinking" should be condemned as being organized regression to childhood or whether it should be valued as a discipline of the development of man depends upon the significance we attach to the emotional experiences of childhood. We must never forget that imagination does not merely employ childish symbols of love, fear, and awe as emotional equivalents for adult experience, but that it recaptures an intenseness and directness of emotional experiences, rarely met with in adult experience. If, in any respect whatsoever, these "childish" experiences are more important than comparable adult ones, imagination or fantasy thinking in making "infantile" emotions available for use in adult living, performs a tremendously valuable psychic service. On the psychic plane, childhood need not necessarily be the immaturity of man, it may be much more the preparatory stage of the adult mind, just as the tadpole is the preparatory stage of the frog rather than an immature frog.

We have an inkling of the fact that our mind is not entirely described within the four dimensions of the physical continuum. It is situated simultaneously within the material universe and elsewhere. It may insert itself into the cerebral cells and stretch outside space and time. We know that our physical individuality comes into being when the spermatozoon enters the egg. But before this moment, the elements of our body are already in existence, scattered in the tissues of our remotest ancestors. We depend on the past in an organic and indissoluble manner. But at the same time our tissues prepare the future while fulfilling their own life. Thus, we are linked to the future, although our self does not extend outside the present. In the same way as our bodily existence is inseparably connected with the material universe, so also our other aspect, called mind, is linked to the past and the future. Thus, it possesses both human and superhuman powers. In fact, it is imagination that stretches into the realm of the superhuman. And doubtless we should have to look upon imagination as the means which enables man to retain the values of the superhuman, of godship, while fulfilling the destiny of man.

It is our momentarily constellated individuality which is either male or female, that is to say, our masculinity or femininity is a segment out of the whole which, in terms of our empirical world, is both masculinity and femininity together. Just as in the male that factor or quality which is called maleness, is encased in the temporal and spatial frame called man, so also that other factor called femaleness is encased in the temporal and spatial frontier called woman. But both are only so many images of the indivisible whole. Now, when through imagination a man gains an insight into the fact that his male field of consciousness is but a tiny fraction of the mind that stretches beyond his individuality into the realm of godship, the repercussion of this experience will be that he takes a different view of women. For with him it is femininity that is linked to the superhuman, which in the form of a woman, a divine woman as that, appears before his eyes. He will look upon women as so many manifestations of what has been excluded by his dominant maleness. And he will realize that suffering, which has resulted from his one-sidedness, will not be ended by suppressing all that which is not male, but that it will be ended when maleness and femaleness intermingle in the indivisible whole. In retaining the values of godship in his human life he will respect the women and treat them with awe, because harmonious participation is more important than brutal dominance. Thus the cult of women means to acknowledge the value of the woman and to take her as a guide in the profound drama of integration. For it is she who transcends the frontiers erected by the male. And again there is this interplay between the within and the without. Out of the world, symbolized by the woman, man's soul is born, but out of the depths of his soul the world is born. This world is a richer world. It is not a world based on psychic famine, but one based upon emotional economy of abundance.

For the male the woman is simultaneously a material object and a goddess. He may learn from her and become inspired. Through her a world of love and beauty may be created. Nowhere has her double aspect been described in a more beautiful way than by Anaṅgavajra :

"The Wisdom-Perfection ( prajñāpāramitā ) must be adored everywhere by those who strive for liberation. Pure she stays in the realm beyond this empirical world ( *paramārthe* ); in this empirical world ( *saṁvṛtyā* ) she has assumed the form of a woman.

"In the disguise of a woman ( *lalanārūpam āsthāya* ) she is everywhere present. Therefore the vajranātha has stated that she is born from the outer world ( *bāhyārthasambhavā* )".[1]

---

[1] Prajñopāyaviuiścayasiddhi V 22-23.

Similarly Lakṣmīṁkarā, the sister of Indrabhūti, exclaims that "Women in all social positions must never be despised. A woman is Divine Wisdom ( *bhagavatī prajñā* ). Only in this world she has assumed bodily form".[1]

However, this interplay between the cult of women and the cult of the soul with all its social implications is but one step toward the goal. It is primarily meant to open man's eyes up to the fact that winning one's soul and forgetting the world is as dangerous and morbid as losing one's soul and gaining the world and subjugating nature. A man whose consciousness is focussed upon the objective world, because he expects the decisive factor for his life to come from outer objects and events, runs the risk to be attracted by the external objects to such a degree as to get lost in them. The more he gives vent to this drive the more he is doomed. For an external object or event need not necessarily be normal, even in the best possible case it is only valid for the time being. However successful he may be considered, his success in life is nothing in comparison with what he should have achieved. He has simply played his role as a member of a social and biological team. On the other hand, a man who starts from the inner world, which is not identical with his ego but exists before an ego has developed at all, will subjectivate his consciousness to such a morbid degree as to become alienated from the world. He tends to press the immense richness of the inner world into his ego and make it the subject of non-subjective processes. This artificial subjectivation of the ego results in its hypertrophy and is as morbid as the depletion of consciousness which causes the individual to measure up to expectations and to fulfill duties. This latter process seems to be the normal activity of the Western man, because an undue emphasis is laid by him upon the externalized, material mass-man value of his civilized age, which is an age of worthy pasteurized personalities, of meager passions and spiritual involutions. However, there is no difference between the man who subjectivates his petty ego and the man who is nothing but a puppet playing his appointed role in society. Both are oblivious to their real nature. Both are mildly neurotic personalities. None can bear the other.

---

[1] Advayasiddhi
*thams-cad-rigs-nas byuṅ-ba-yi*
*bud-med-dag-la brtag mi bya*
*de-ñid bcom-ldan pha-rol phyin*
*kun-rdsob-tsam-gyis gzugs-ñid do*

Although the cult of the soul elevates the image of the woman, makes it shine forth in divine splendour, it would be erroneous to assume that this spiritualization—a term, highly misleading, because there is nothing that might and could be spiritualized,—corresponds to a kind of striving for what is like a Platonic idea of femininity and makes man go down on his knees before a phantasma called the Eternal Feminine. Masculinity and femininity are only manifestations in this multiple world. And it is just the same if I call this world material or spiritual, because both these aspects have been carved from the whole by our methods. For this reason, neither the physical aspect of masculinity and femininity nor the spiritual aspect of these manifestations is something ultimate. Man must realize that he moves in a world of pictures, of abstractions, which, after they have been added together, are still less rich than the concrete fact. He must learn that what he calls a man or a woman is not so much a descriptive term for concrete facts, but one by which he is given not only pictorial knowledge about, but actual insight into the nature of spiritual relations. Man and woman are not separate entities. From the things encountered in the world, whether rocks and clouds, earth and water, men and animals, certain qualities have been abstracted. These abstractions, and not the concrete facts, are the matter of reasoning. But they may be mistaken for the concrete; fragmentary aspects may be considered as representing the whole. The most simple abstraction is the objective man and the objective woman. But the transfiguration of the objective woman in a divine appearance should make man realize that everything that lives transcends the artificial frontiers erected by these abstractions. This insight is blocked when he concretizes the abstractions and thus deepens the cleavage between himself and what is so essential for completeness. For when the fascinating beauty of these abstractions, whether of our physical existence or of our spiritual one, dominates our mind and enslaves our thoughts in the realm of matter and spirit, it becomes dangerous. Man must continue asking questions which, from the point of view of sound, scientific criticism, are meaningless. Curiosity must inexorably draw him onward to unknown countries. A man who is content with his self-made abstractions is far from being a man. He is just a brute. In order to bring to light his true nature, his incredible potentialities, and the way to realize them man needs guideposts, just as he needs dreams to perceive reality. Thus also he needs gods and goddesses. Only through them he will understand certain significant aspects of reality which now escape him. Through the woman, who appears in divine splendour before his eyes, he will discover that in addition to the pleasure-principle which he exemplifies by lying with a woman when he feels a sudden biological urge, there is also a joy-principle which he may discover by enjoying in imagination all the women that all the men in the world have ever wanted to enjoy, or ever will want to enjoy. Though imaginary, this would not be an unreal woman, but a woman of augmented reality. The vivid experience of this state of mind is, of course, a kind of dream, but it is not merely a lucid dream, it *is* a perception of reality in which all objects retain their logical relationships while taking on a completely new emotional meaning. It is a world of harmony, a world that embraces everything, because it is everything. Here man ceases to be a shadowy schema. The veil which normally lies between all men and all sources of light has been lifted. Thus the contraries of masculinity and femininity with their endless varieties and transformations expose man's insularity, criticize the questionable idealisms of just being a man or a woman, and serve as guideposts toward the apprehension of the invisible substratum of man and of the universe. Therefore, Sahajayogini Cintā is right in stating,

"That man may wake up to his true nature, pure in itself and without duality, (this invisible point) manifests itself in the shape of a man and of a woman".[1]

However, if a man does not learn that he is operating with pictures or abstractions, falsely taking the images for concrete facts, the consequences of this delusion will be very grave. He will blame his lack of inner peace and integration on other people who have schemed against him and given him a "dirty deal." The more he broods on this matter, the more he becomes convinced of the fact that, if people are plotting against him, he must be a very important person, a genius, a heaven-sent reformer. These two examples are clearly recognizable as illustrating the delusion of persecution and the delusion of grandeur which, when they become deeply embedded in his personality, characterize the dangerous disease of paranoia. Most of us behave at times as if there were something of the paranoid in us. We harbor suspicions about our fellow-men's attitudes and intentions toward us and exaggerate ideas of our own importance. Usually we recognize the milder imaginings as delusions, are ashamed of them and try to repress them, instead of trying to find out from whence these delusions sprang. But in most cases we are unaware of this prevalence of delusion in our lives, because it is institutional rather than personal. Of course, we easily recognize these delusions of persecution and grandeur, when they arise in the minds of men belonging to a group which is not our own. But when these delusions are part of our own ideology it is almost impossible for us to see the truth. The constant feeling of lurking menace, the craving for security, and the futile endeavour to keep up one's exaggerated self-importance, so characteristic of modern cloak-and-dagger civilization, are basically attributable to the fact that images which should have been taken as guideposts and gateways toward the realization of all the potentialities in man, were mistaken for the thing itself—the finger pointing at the moon was taken for the moon.

---

[1] Vyaktabhāvānugatatattvasiddhi

*ḥdir gñis-su-med-ciṅ raṅ-bzin-gyis rnam-par-dag-pai lhan-cig-skyes-pai gnas-skabs-su| bdag-ñid-kyi don-de rtogs-par-bya-bai phyir| bdag-ñid skyes-pa daṅ| bud-med-kyi gzugs-su mṅon-par-sprul-te|*

How dangerous it is to mistake an image for a concrete fact and to forget the meaning over the form, can most clearly be seen from the cult of the Holy Virgin during the early European Middle Ages, the direct consequence of which was the persecution of witches. The cult of the Holy Virgin Mary was closely related to the cult of women which started during the time of the troubadours. The appraisal of women, of their spiritual qualities such as tenderness, love, kindness and charity, rather than of their physical beauty, was indicative of the development of the feeling that man alone was incapable of attaining the goal of true manhood, without being inspired by ideals beyond his manliness. For too long a time there had been a kind of dictatorship of the ego over the more generous elements of the soul. The woman, whose divine qualities appeared before the eyes of the man and made her all the more lovable, incited the knight to seek the adventures of the lower and higher worlds. It was a quest to become worthy of her and to become united with her both on the physical and spiritual level. The man found himself in an extraordinary psychological situation, which was not only a social problem, but a deeply religious one. This religious aspect of the cult of women was a challenge to the dictatorship of the Church. The fact that woman was endowed with divine qualities, a godlike being, appeared to the Church as a revival of paganism. Like all dictatorships, dedicated to the cult of power and prestige, the Church was forever haunted by a lurking sense of insecurity which no triumphs and no purges of enemies—in this case of heresies—can ever quite set at rest. However, this new movement which raised woman above the level of biological destination was too strong as to be simply ignored, or to be put aside off-handed. So the cult of women which implied the development of all that which had been excluded from the world of the male, was converted into the cult of the Holy Virgin Mary who had no place in early Christendom with its Cosmic Dictator and its other exclusively male factors. The results were terrific. For now the cult of the Holy Virgin became a weapon in the hands of the central dictatorship, serving as a purchased magistrate serves a tyrant, to legalize crime, converting murder into execution, attacks on others, into misunderstood crusades. The meaning was sacrificed for the form, unimportant paraphernalia were considered as essential, and any deviation from the form was a blasphemy. While the meaning of the cult of women was to deepen the awareness of emotional satisfaction arising from participation rather than from elimination, and to pave the way toward the realization of man's true nature, this cultural development was stopped short by twisting it into the formalism of the cult of the Holy Virgin whose image had been rigidly defined by that time and attained a definite place in the semi-political hierarchy of the Church. Since the objective woman who somehow represented those qualities which the male sought to acquire, because they were so essential for his psychological integration, was replaced by the standardized image of the Holy Virgin, she lost more and more in dignity and became slowly degraded to a level which was still lower than her previous one. Everything that was sublime and had made her respectable was taken from her and placed in unattainable distance. But she continued being a factor in man's life. While he formerly was inspired by her, he now felt persecuted by her. For the tyranny of his dualistic weltanschaung weighed most heavily upon his life. Against the ideal of godlike womanhood stood the actual woman, the victim and the tool of Satan, the witch. In his zeal to exalt or safeguard the pedigrees of truth and error, of God and Satan, he felt called upon to defend truth and to fight error. Ruled by terror and in terror he turned an amiable witch-hunter, —amiable, because everything was so rational. Even his victims were convinced of the rightness of this mass paranoia.

The interruption and distortion of a spiritual process at an early stage has deprived the woman of her dignity and has made the man a renegade. It has caused ruthlessness and lack of scruple. But the problem of integration is still waiting to be solved. The solution will not be found, if the economic or educational level of women is gradually raised. This might even mean that she is becoming more miserable. For if the recognition of human dignity is not increasing at the same rate, she will get more hurt than happiness from her progress. The higher she rises from the servant or slave state, the more bitterly she will feel the gap between the place she has earned by her own efforts and the recognition accorded her by the male. If she is expected to consider the male as her lord, then the very scale of her achievement will be the measure of her humiliation. Man must give up his paranoid attitude toward the woman, but he must find the way all by himself. No committee, no encyclical letter will help him. Moral maxims which run in mere negatives are useless.

## 8. The Various Stages in Integration.

Although I shall try to make the subject-matter of this chapter as clear as possible, I am fully aware of the many difficulties that are inherent in this attempt. The problem of integration can be approached in a better way through actual life than through intellect and science. Moreover, for the uninitiated Western mind it is exceedingly difficult to understand the symbolic language used in the Buddhist texts. Indian thinking makes it entirely clear that it is concerned with non-intuitible relations rather than with theories of construction, which are connected with symbols in the sense of sensuous intuition. The Buddhist symbols do not describe the sensuous schemes or models by which it is sought to represent or "picture" reality; they refer to formulas by which relations rather than things are represented. The entire import is on function and not on substance. In this respect Buddhism is on a level with the trends in modern science. Modern sciences, especially mathematics and physics, give us a "picture" or symbolic representation of a complex of relations. The ideal of science is no longer to picture but to predict. That is to say, formerly, to know or to understand a physical happening in nature was equivalent to our ability to make a mechanical model or picture of it; nowadays, the procedure which makes prediction possible is that we make for ourselves symbols of such a character that the necessary relations of the pictures correspond to necessary relations in the objects. Thus, to understand a phenomenon in nature is no longer dependent upon our ability to make a mechanical model of it. The mechanical models are reduced to the role of mere dummies. Necessary for understanding are the mathematical formulas in which these dummies function. But the important thing is that in such a representation there are no longer any things to talk about. They are all dissolved into relations. Even such ultimate units as remain are not independent reals but can be described merely as essences which become real by entering relations. However, this mathematical-physical structure is certainly not the world. It presents only that aspect of the world which is accessible to the mathematician or physicist. Understanding of this sphere does not mean understanding of man or of the cosmos. It is exactly here that Buddhism differs from modern science. Unlike scientific symbols the Buddhist symbols do not merely represent, through partial coincidence, characters and relations. They are, or at least are supposed to be, a vehicle or medium of insight. While the merely intrinsic symbol only represents, because the symbol is not identical with the thing symbolized, although there is partial coincidence of such a character as to make analogous predication possible, the insight symbol goes deeper. It makes us see. But more than this, whether the scientist speaks of man or the cosmos, of nature or human nature, by the very fact that he speaks the language of science is implied that he has excluded the qualities and values of things. Because science excludes all values—unless it does so it cannot get under way at all—it is always in some sense mechanical. It is erroneous to assume that because mechanism in the older sense has broken down, mechanism in its intrinsic character has been given up. The mechanical models of older physics may have been abandoned, but the mathematical models that have been substituted are no less mechanical. The exclusion of all values means the mechanization of science and of life in general. Buddhist symbols, although they too are operational, never exclude the values and qualities of what they speak about. The function of Buddhist symbols is to make us see things other than in the contexts of the practical, the material, and the "natural," to throw light upon this very world. In other words, the Buddhist symbols seek to shed light on existence in its totality by figures that are taken from the phenomenal, from single aspects of existence as it appears in our experience, while the scientific symbols seek to shed light on more complex relations of existence by figures from the more intuitible, and the referend is still phenomenal. All this has to be borne in mind if we actually want to understand the meaning of the various stages in human growth and development.

As soon as a man and a woman meet, the situation and the relation between these two becomes rather complicated through subjective as well as objective factors which considerably influence and mould their behaviour. Since neither of them can pretend to be completely aware of all the latent potentialities, to say nothing of having actualized them, many factors are obscure to them. And this is the very reason that neither of them knows only an insignificant part of the other as well as of himself. This partial knowledge carries with it the fact that most of the actions of both the male and the female are dependent upon unconscious motivations, although each one believes to act very consciously, because the momentary content of consciousness is always over-evaluated. It is therefore not to be wondered at that each individual under these circumstances presupposes the same attitude and the same interests with the other. On account of this identity it is hardly possible to speak of a truly mental relationship, for mental relationship presupposes a fairly high degree of awareness. There can be no doubt that on this level of human relations the positions of the male and the female are more or less defined and regulated by customs and that the relationship of man and woman is mainly concerned with the propagation of the species. Although in course of time consciousness expands and, in conquering the outer world, fortifies its own sphere of power and possessiveness, yet it becomes more and more identical with and subservient to the biological function of man. Moreover, the interest of the individual is directed toward the outer world, the objects of which are so attractive and fascinating that the individual hardly feels it incumbent upon him to look for something else.

For the male the nearest and most attractive object in this world is the woman. He wants to possess her and to exert his power on her.

> As the grim lion fawneth o'er his prey,
> Sharp hunger by the conquest satisfied
> So o'er this sleeping soul doth Tarquin stay,
> His rage of lust by gazing qualified;
> Slack'd, not suppress'd, for standing by her side,
> His eye, which late this mutiny restrains,
> Unto a greater uproar tempts his veins:
> And they, like straggling slaves for pillage fighting,
> Obdurate vassals fell exploits effecting,
> In bloody death and ravishment delighting,
> Nor children's tears nor mothers' groans respecting,
> Swell in their pride, the onset still expecting:
> Anon his beating heart, alarum striking,
> Gives the hot charge and bids them do their liking.
> His drumming heart cheers up his burning eye,
> His eye commends the leading to his hand;
> His hand, as proud of such a dignity,
> Smoking with pride, march'd on to make his stand
> On her bare breast, the heart of all her land;
> Whose ranks of blue veins, as his hand did scale,
> Left their round turrets destitute and pale[1].

It is in the realm of the sex drive and in the fever of desire that here the relation of man and woman expresses itself most effectively. It is the lowest stage; there is hardly any mental relation. This biological relationship of man and woman has been described most clearly by Nāropa, who calls it the Karmamudrā:

---

[1] William Shakespeare, The Rape of Lucrece.

"Karmamudrā means a woman with (exuberant) breasts and (a rich display of) hair. She is the impetus to and sustaining power of (*hetu*) pleasure on the biological level (*kāmadhātu*). Karman (the activity involved in this relation between man and woman) means kissing, embracing, touching the genitals, erection of the penis and so on and so forth. A mudrā which is characterized by instigating these items (in love life) is said to set up (a certain kind of) relationship (*pratyayakāriṇī*). This relationship yields only transient pleasure (*kṣarasukha*). The term *mudrā* is used, because (such a woman) gives special pleasure (*mudaṁ*) and sexual satisfaction (*ratiṁ*)."[48]

Although all the drives, among which the sex drive plays an important role, postulate and even enforce the fulfillment with reference to their objective, they cannot be evaluated as to their biological domain exclusively. Such could only be the case if man and woman were absolutely unaware of themselves as well as of each other. Yet each one is aware of his own sex, while the tendencies and features of the opposite sex appear extrajected and give rise to longing for the other sex. This state is characterized by a fanciful apperception of reality, because in every case in which a subject establishes a rapport with an object due to extrajection, there will be a combination of true projection and objectivation. True projection is either subject-related, that is to say, qualities of an extraject, i. e. the object representation which emerges in extrajection, are incorrectly imputed to an external object, or object-related, that is to say, qualities of a remembered object are incorrectly imputed to an external object. These two factors, projection and objectivation, determine what one "sees" in an object. The less an individual is aware of all his potentialities and the more he is concerned with his visible physical sex, the more he is under the spell of these unconscious contents. This mix-up of subjective and objective factors entangles him more and more in the objective world, where he thinks to find what he wants and needs, and leads him away from his very nature. Though compulsory and embarrassing, this dependence on objects, that is, on the woman, will not appear as such to the man. By having intercourse with the woman and by becoming absorbed in the spell of the sex drive he may have the feeling that his insularity has been abolished and that he has become reunited with what was wanting in him and caused his disequilibrium. However, this re-equilibration is only temporary. The man will forthwith be plagued by frustration and haunted by anxiety, for total satisfaction and complete freedom from anxiety elude him. He is still far from having realized Great Bliss (*mahāsukha*). In this stage of male-female relationship, to the emotional tyrannies and contagions of society, from which he cannot isolate himself if he desires, are added the residua of individual experience, the memories of the tiresome skittishness and equally tiring exigencies of the females' always evading you when you want them and forcing themselves upon you when you do not want them. And more than this, man possesses more appetites than his sexual organs can satisfy. But unaware of the disproportion between drive and spirit and of the actual reason of his disequilibrium he is tempted into the vicious circle of seeking all the more in the objective world around him, in order to quench the burning thirst and hunger for completeness and total satisfaction. This, as a matter of fact, is the reason that in most cases the relationship between men and women is confined in the realm of the biological drive. But since in this way the man somehow fails in his adjustment to surplus reality his human state should be considered as a biological neurosis.

---

[48] Sekoddeśaṭīkā, p. 56.

This is what Advayavajra says in his small, yet most difficult, essay on the mudrās. I give here the first part in translation[1]:

"EVAM (comprises everything and he who has understood the meaning of this word has understood all and everything).

I worship the Vajrasattva who is purest knowledge, and for man's self-realization I shortly will discuss the sequence of the *mudrās*.

Since men here do not understand the sequence of the *mudrās*, they work under delusions and suffer in erring about in the ocean of existence. In order that they may grasp the meaning of the four *mudrās*, the means of the realization of Great Bliss (*mahāsukha*) is discussed here for their benefit according to the teachings of the Tantras. There are four *mudrās*:

1. the *karmamudrā*,
2. the *dharmamudrā*,
3. the *mahāmudrā*, and
4. the *samayamudrā*.

This is the nature of the Karmamudrā: *karman* comprises everything that expresses itself in deeds, words, and thoughts. A *mudrā* which is characterized in this way is (bound up with and by nature) imagination (*kalpanāsvarūpā*). He who has intercourse with a Karmamudrā experiences (various stages of) pleasure and bliss (*ānanda*), all of which belong to certain moments. (As has been said):

---

[1] Advayavajra, Caturmudrā, pp. 32-33.

Out of the knowledge of the moments (there comes) the knowledge of bliss, culminating and ending in the EVAM.

There are four degrees of pleasure and bliss:

1. (ordinary) pleasure (*ānanda*),
2. transport (*paramānanda*),
3. satiety (*viramānanda*), and
4. bliss (*sahajānanda*).

The sentence, "look upon what lies between transport and satiety and keep it," has no meaning, (unless "bliss" is placed before "satiety.")

There are four moments:

1. stimulus (*vicitra*),
2. elaborated reflex (*vipāka*),
3. final response (*vimarda*), and
4. the moment after consummation with its incredible awareness of all potentialities (*vilakṣaṇa*).[1]

---

[1] I have altered the sequence of the *ānandas* and of the moment, in accordance with Sekoddeśaṭīkā, pp. 26, 28, 36, 42. In his Tattvaviṁśikā verse 1, Advayavajra gives the same sequence as the one adopted by me. As will be seen later on, the description of the Karmamudrā in Advayavajra's work comprises some aspects of the Jñānamudrā. Although Advayavajra differs from Nāropa to a certain extent, the issue is the same. Advayavajra's four Mudrās are

Karmamudrā
Dharmamudrā
Mahāmudrā
Samayamudrā

Roughly speaking, they correspond to Nāropa's four Mudrās;

Karmamudrā
Jñānamudrā
Mahāmudrā
Phalamudrā

From the Seka (section of the Kālacakratantra) we gather that the moment after consummation (*vilakṣaṇa*) is the central experience. From the Haṭhayoga, however, we gather that at the end of bliss belonging to the moment after consummation (*sahajavilakṣaṇayor ante*) duration sets in.

This has been expounded by the Exalted One in the Seka-Haṭhayoga:

Everything that exists (may be called) the very nature of all that exists (*sahaja*), because (everything that exists) is, as it were, a reflection of the very nature of all that exists. The reflection of the very nature of all things produces knowledge which is similar to the very nature of all things. (This knowledge) is knowledge starting from the without (*prajñājñāna*), (but although it seems to come from the phenomenal world it is by nature) the very nature of things (*sahaja*). Therefore (it is incorrect to say that) the very nature of all things (and its apprehension) starts from (and originates in) knowledge coming from the without (i. e. the without and the within are abstractions of our mind, they are one and the same and cannot be reduced to the one or to the other. Therefore whatever we experience and whatever we learn is not an internalization of overt activity. Everything has been latent within us and has been waiting to be "discovered." For this reason "knowledge that starts from the "without" is essentially the same as the "very nature of all that exists"). That which is called the very nature of all things is the uncreatedness (*akṛtrima*) of all phenomena.

He who busies himself with the Karmamudrā experiences (as movement) what in itself is unmoved (*nispandaphala*). That which in itself is unmoved appears (in our phenomenal world) as movement (and this movement is) similar (to the unmoved). Similarity is to be understood in the following way: In the same way as the image of the face reflected in a mirror is not the face itself—neither has it gone there previously nor has it not gone there—and only produces a likeness of the face, (so also is the relation between the unmoved and the moved). All the world (ignorant of how matters stand) is delighted, because they believe to have seen their faces. Ignorant teachers behave in the same way. Clinging to outer knowledge they feel delighted, because they believe to have experienced the true nature of all things. In their illusory happiness they do not know the ways of the *dharmamudrā*: They are ignorant of the *dharmamudrā*, because they busy themselves with the *karmamudrā*, exclusively, and yet (the *karmamudrā*) is but an indirect and artificial relation.

How then comes about the (realization of the) uncreated which is called the very nature of all things? From like causes spring like effects, but not from unlike ones, in the same way as rice grows from a seed of rice, but not *kodravya* (Paspalum scrobiculatum). Thus from the uncreated *dharmamudrā* springs the uncreated nature of all things. For this reason the *dharmamudrā* is said to be the cause of the *mahāmudrā* as well as of the very nature of all things). Although there is no difference (between the *dharmamudrā* and) the *mahāmudrā*, in our everyday language we speak of a difference. Why is that so? The Exalted One has said that

> The divine form of the E, adorned in its middle with the VAM, is the birth-place of all pleasures and bliss, the treasure-house of the Buddhas.

(The term) treasure-house (is to be understood in a figurative sense), it is a place, a substratum (to our modes of thinking), because it is a reflection of Buddhahood (which is the very nature of bliss). (In this figurative sense) the lotus flower (*saroruha*, the vulva as the birthplace of the living and itself very much alive) of a karmamudrā is an ocean of fullness of bliss. This (lotus flower or vulva) is a transparent place (*svaccham āsthānaṁ*); when in the Avadhūti it is united with and permeated by the *bodhicitta* (the unmoved, symbolized by the sperma or the male organ) which seems to expand and to get lost (*saṁvṛti-savta-spanda-rūpa*, i. e., what to the unenlightened mind appears as the beginning of the orgasm) this union being comparable to the mixture of the essences of myrrh and nutmeg (*bolakakkola*, also symbol for sexual union), (a kind of) knowledge arises, which is momentary and a lower form of the very nature of all things (*kṣaṇikanāmāparasahajākhya*) This (knowledge) is not the unmoved which is the very nature of all things (*sahajanispanda*). It is by nature knowledge starting from the without, which comprises three kinds of pleasure and bliss and extends over four moments. In the Seka and Haṭhayoga (this experience) is called the feeling as motion of what is unmoved (*nispandaphala*) in connection with a karmamudrā."

I am fully aware of the fact that this "translation" can hardly be called a translation. Advayavajra himself declared that he was a friend of brevity and, as a matter of fact, his essays are rarely more than hints. Moreover, what he discusses are most intimate experiences which cannot be expressed in a simple language. That does not mean, of course, that something is to be concealed. It simply means that ordinary language fails as means of communication. More than this, the Occidental mind encounters almost insurmountable difficulties, because owing to its concretizing tendencies and its interest in the objective world it cannot understand that reality cannot be reduced to either the physical or to the mental. Deeply steeped in its philosophy of nothingbutism and starting from the assumption that only words that have literal significance are significant at all, and that scientific concepts also are literal copies, it has torn out all anthropomorphisms and, in so doing, it has been eating out its own heart. For in relegating all anthropomorphisms, all human metaphors, it has in the end even cut the ground from under knowledge. The anthropomorphic form is the only possible way of rendering what concerns man, the only form which gives intrinsic intelligibility in connection with man. But when man is spoken of in non-human terms, all intrinsic understanding vanishes and only instrumental intelligibility is achieved. In the same way as the final extrusion of all anthropomorphic notions constituted the triumph of modern physical science, so also the triumph of modern physical science may be due to the extrusion of the physical mythology from this region. While knowledge of the physical world proceeded by means of symbols taken from the living and mental, knowledge of the latter proceeded by means of symbols taken from the bodily and physical. The end effect has been the same. Modern Western thought has lost the ability to catch the immediately experienced quality of things and, in addition to this something in the eternal nature of things. Fascinated by their game of creating "verbiage" the Westerners are unable to conjure up, so to speak, the entire gamut of human emotions which characterize any relation between individuals. With the Indians the "life" of things and relations is caught in the very form of expression. As a language-device EVAM is obviously unsatisfactory, it corresponds to the use of an imaginary number where a real one should suffice, but when the emotional awareness of a given experience transcends the conventional evaluation of it, meaning is lost unless transposed into some form of magical syntax. The rapture of wholeness possibly reflects such simple verbalizations of ecstasy as this very EVAM. For similarly Kāṇha says that "He who has understood (the meaning of) EVAM has thoroughly understood everything. It is the mould of Reality. Oh, it is the garment of its Lord".[1]

What then is the meaning of EVAM? The "meaning" of a symbol can be expressed only in language. This involves an expansion of it, which is sometimes said to be a substitution of literal and non-metaphorical sentences for metaphorical and symbolic sentences. Such an expansion is met with in the following sentences:

> "E is the mother, VA is the father, the nasal (*bindu*) is their meeting, and this meeting is the most sublime sound (*akṣara*). E is wisdom (*prajñā*), VA is the loving husband (suratādhipa); the nasal is the virgin reality (*anāhataṁ tattvaṁ*); out of it all (other) sounds arise".[2]

---

1. Kâṇha 21 :

*ebaṁkāra jē bujjhia tē bujjhia saala aśesa*
*dhamma-karaṇḍaho sohu re nia pahukero beśa*

2. Subhâṣitasaṁgraha, f. 76, from the Devendraparipṛcchâtantra :

*e-kāras tu bhaven mātā va-kāras tu pitā smṛtaḥ*
*bindus tatra bhaved yogaḥ saṁyogaḥ paramākṣaraḥ*
*e-kāras tu bhaved prajñā va-kāras suratādhipaḥ*
*binduś cānāhataṁ tattvaṁ taj-jātāny akṣarāṇi ca*

To these verses the quotation from the Mūlatantra by Nâropa in his Sekodeśaṭīkâ, p. 4, may be compared :

*e-kāro gaganāloko dharmadhātuḥ*
*vaṁ-kāraḥ sugatavyūha e-kāre samyagviṣṭhitaḥ*

"The letter E is called the true nature of things (*dharmadhātu*), which is as bright as the sky. The letter VAN is the crowd of the Buddhas, which is firmly rooted in the letter E."

However, thus to expand the symbol tends to defeat its end as symbol. The "sense" or value of the symbol as a symbol is lost. Therefore expansion cannot consist in substituting literal for symbol-sentences, but rather in deepening and enriching the meaning of the symbol. Thus expansion of a symbol is the development of its unexpressed reference. What this statement means is that every symbol takes its material from the realm of the narrower, more intuitible fields of experience, chiefly from certain great and fundamental relations of nature and human beings, and uses it for expressions of more universal and non-intuitible relations which cannot be expressed directly. The symbol expresses something too great for words; yet if we ask what this something is we must either be silent or seek to give it linguistic expression. It is indeed the character of every symbol that it represents forces, but these forces are not the "forces of nature" or the "forces of man" in the scientific sense at all; they are the forces of reality before reality has been transformed by the formation of a concept of nature and man as opposed to supernature and the superhuman. Reality is represented in forms, but these are not "projections" into nature but rather the primary way of apprehending nature and man in so far as they are immediately given. Living knowledge is always linked up with what may be called symbolic consciousness. This is a unique type of consciousness which differs from the ordinary cognitive consciousness. The ordinary cognitive consciousness assumes, tacitly at least, that any representation of reality is in some sense a "copy", in other words that the re-presentation is in some sense literal. The symbolic consciousness, on the other hand, modifies the intuited in such a fashion as to make the intuition a symbol for the non-intuited. It effects, so to speak, a distortion of and deviation from reality. But this deviation is achieved in order to endow an occurrence in space and time with a meaning to which greater value or significance is given than belong to it in its pure actuality. This statement is of far reaching importance, for it means that man is not moulded on reality, that he is not a copy of something antecedently given and wholly independent of man, but that he is rather the mould in which reality first expresses itself. Man is the actuality of reality or rather should be. It is only as the brute given thus actualizes and expresses itself in man that this given becomes, in any meaningful and intelligible sense, reality.

It is the prevalence of cognitive consciousness with its copy notion that makes man live in the sphere of the merely "natural" given existence, in the mere biological process, that whatever meaning there is in life is lost. A significant illustration of this statement is found in the relation of man and woman, expressed under the symbol of the Karmamudrā. There we have a model of the physical world in a narrower sense. But this model is always partly fictional. It is for this reason that, in the end, it suddenly breaks in our hands. It sheds light, but only a partial light. Only in a certain way we have "understood" at all. This is clearly brought out in the correlation of the various pleasures in the cognitive process. The first moment, called stimulus (*vicitra*) comprises both the stimulus of the object and the attention of the subject. Its emotional correlate is ordinary pleasure (*ānanda*). The second moment, called elaborated response (*vipāka*), is that process which attempts to combine the various stimuli and aspects of the given object into a fairly coherent whole. The emotional tone of this process is transport (*paramā nanda*). The third moment, the final or consummatory response (*vimarda*), means that the object apparently has been thoroughly understood. It has nothing to offer any more. The feeling of pleasantness and motor quiescence (*viramānanda*) permeates the individual. It is exactly at this point where the whole thing breaks in our hands. This will become clear when we consider the manifest behaviour of man and woman. First, man and woman are attracted by and become interested in each other. Motor activity is aroused. Then the man "explores" the charms of the woman, his exploration finally ending in sexual intercourse. With the orgasm the final response is made. He now believes that he "knows" the woman, but this knowledge is not very much convincing. His knowledge breaks is his hands, and so he starts all over again. He should have passed from the sensuous and intuitible to the metempirical and non-intuitible. It is this failure to do so, that is responsible for the exaggeration of sex behaviour, for nymphomania in the female and satyriasis in the male, and for the Western philosophy of nothingbutism, the peculiar attitude of those, who have been taught that sex is the most base activity of man, all of a sudden discover that it is the most basic and that there is nothing but sex. Hence the sexualization of modern civilization. While the relation of man and woman on the biological level should have been an incentive to seek and to realize all the latent potentialities as well as to embody the values of reality in life, the dim light of cognitive consciousness (*prajñājñāna*) has caught the human spirt in the toils of its own creations. It has woven a veil between man and immediate reality.

Man and woman are the mould in which reality expresses itself, but this expression is only partial, for reality is an indivisible whole. With man only his superficies is male and manifest in consciousness, while everything female is relegated from this region and for this reason unconscious, Man's unconscious femininity and, likewise, woman's unconscious masculinity consist of various factors. This consisting of various factors, however, does not mean a being composed of separate particles, as gas is composed of molecules. It resembles an intricate network of threads extending in space and time as well as beyond space and time. Part of it is experienced in dreams and in fantasies. We do not create dreams, but are confronted with them through a process by means of which the latent content of the dream transforms itself into the manifest content. Through it we are beginning to realize that our individual surface is not our real frontier, that it merely sets up between us and the cosmic universe a cleavage apparently indispensable to our action. In the same way as our body is made up of the chemical substances of environment, which enter it and are built up into temporary edifices, so also mind stretches beyond the four dimensions of the physical continuum. It may insert itself into what we call our body, like an alga, which fastens to a rock and lets its tendrils drift out into the mysteries of the ocean. We are consciously aware of the individual's center, yet do not know where his outer limits are located. These limits are, as a matter of fact, purely hypothetical. Perhaps they do not exist. Each man and each woman is bound to those who precede and follow them. In some manner they fuse into them. The independence of each individual from the other as from the whole cosmos is an illusion A man and a woman are but so many castles whose dungeons are surrounded by and built up out of the vast environment. In exactly the same way human consciousness is surrounded and supported by the superhuman unconscious. While the ego, comparable to a castle, tries to extend its lines of fortification, the unconscious secretly finds its way into the castle believed to be safe from all assaults. In other words, the more the ego insists on the "literal" aspect of things, the more it is attacked by uncontrollable "symbolic" aspects. The "nervous" break-down of all too successful men clearly illustrates the power of the unconscious over consciousness. The dim awareness of powers beyond the fortifications of the ego is the reason that these powers have been conceived as gods and goddesses, because only that which is encased in our individuality belongs to the human sphere, while everything else that stretches beyond these limits is of superhuman quality.

In the Western world, throughout the centuries a battle has raged over the temporal priority of man or God. Some believed that God had created man as a copy of himself, some believed that God and the host of gods and goddesses were an invention of man. This battle over the temporal priority of God and man really is not so much a question of temporal priority as of the relations between these two forms of symbolism, the human and superhuman, and of the way in which each influences the development of the other. The question of actual priority cannot, of course, be empirically determined. That which seems undoubted is that from the beginning man and God stand in inseparable correlation, out of which they gradually developed as independent processes. Both are expressions of one fundamental tendency to symbol formation, the principle of radical metaphor that lies at the heart of all symbolizing function. Neither is man a creation or copy of God nor is God an invention of man. Both are pictures or symbols crystallized on the surface of ineffable reality, the mould in which reality has expressed itself. The question of the primacy of the one over the other is purely speculative. If speculation becomes self-important and the correlation of God and man is lost sight of, because undue emphasis is laid upon assumptions rather than on verifiable data, the way toward the realization of man's true nature is completely blocked. The result is fanaticism and dogmaticism; the best means to keep man in ignorance (*avidyā*) and to misuse him for selfish ends. The whole atmosphere is poisoned. Consequently, any dogmatically limited organization contributes very little guidance to its adherents in what are probably the major problems of their lives, and fails to exploit the most significant personal sources of religious dynamism. Certainly, the relation between man and the superhuman is not a theme for an intellectually respectable study. Basic problems of life are not just ones worth adult discussion in an age of scientific enlightenment.

It is part of the activistic and pragmatic tendencies of our age that all manifestations of life are subsumed under the practical rather than the spiritual activities of man. From this point of view the primacy is given to cult and ritual, which are considered to be both more permanent and significant than the allegedly more unstable spiritual elements that gather around them. Certain acts from the physical life of man, such as for instance sexual intercourse, are taken as signs or symbols of something taking place in a more remote, transcendent, and mysterious world, which is too great for words. True as this seems at first sight to be, it really contains a fallacy. For if we ask what these things are too great for words we find that they are spiritual ideas, so to say. They are not just something transposed to another scale.

To call woman a goddess or to say that woman is a goddess incarnate may rightly be just poetry. But poetry is also to be interpreted, and interpretation of poetry is the determination of what poetry says. This assumes that in addition to what the poet says on the face of his poem, he is also saying something which can only be brought out by interpretation. Poetry means what it says, but it does not always say all that it means. There is always a great deal of unexpressed reference. No greater harm could be done than if poetry were taken merely literally. Poetry, like art, is a special revelation of reality whose nature is determined by the principle of value appreciation; the unexpressed reference of the poet's language is always to these values. In other words, the symbolic expression of the poet is the means of apprehending and expressing certain value relations not otherwise expressible. The appraisal and appreciation involve the element. of feeling and emotion, because values cannot be appreciated except through feeling and emotion. But to say that this is the essential function of the symbolic expression of the relationship between a woman and a goddess is to misunderstand and to misrepresent the whole situation. The essential function is to give us insight into or knowledge of certain aspects of reality. But there is still another point I want to make clear. To call woman a goddess is not simply a means of evoking emotions and of referring to human values. We must find out the context in which the woman stands in relation to the goddess. This context brings with it the notion of the uniqueness of such an experience and of the object of that experience, which is truly religious experience. By this is meant that the religious experience, involved in the relation between man and woman, is unique and irreducible to any other form and that this unique quality of experience corresponds with or refers to a unique object. It is, indeed, this uniqueness of experience of man's own femininity transcending his limited male individuality and brightening up the dullness of his narrow, nonsymbolic world of commonsense, that is described by the Jñānamudrā, the second stage in man's spiritual growth and development toward entireness. For, as we have already seen, femininity is a co-implicate of masculinity. neither of them is located somewhere as a distinct entity.n

"The Jñānamudrā is the mould in which man's ow latent potentialities express themselves (*svacittaparikalpitā*). Her nature is (the quality or the value of) the Divine Mother and other goddesses (*viśvamātādidevīsvabhāvā*). She (comprises) all that has been previously experienced (through and at a woman) (*pūrvānubhuktā*). (In this relationship between man and woman) there is knowledge about the impetus to and the sustaining power of pleasure and joy in the intermediate realm of matter and spirit (*rūpadhātusukhasya hetujñānam*), which is characterized as being conditioned upon earlier experiences, such as smiles and enjoyments. The situation (*pratyaya*) is that of the intense sensation-complex accompanying the culmination of coitus (*spandasukha*)".[1]

In order to understand this passage we have shortly to discuss the error of intellectualists—which due to the decline of religious sentiment in modern times has become attached to an interpretation. This error is that statements are interpeted in terms of what is not meant by the statements. The apparent meaning of the passage quoted above seems to be its reference to over-individual social values, while its real meaning seems to be found in the causes, environmental and social, which have produced the images in this statement. In this case, it becomes doubly illusory. It is illusory, in the first place, because, although it apparently refers to the superhuman, it actually refers only to mere human values; it is illusory, in the second place, while it seems to refer to values, in reality it refers to physical causes, the viscero-motor and body motor components in the culmination of coitus. Thus the whole statement becomes meaningless: its silliness is obvious. On the assumption that there is no significance except literal significance, the literalist and rationalist will reduce such statements a the above quoted ones to "emotional outbreaks" and deny that they really say anything. Unfortunately this goes counter to all facts. They say a great deal and what they say is highly significant. The assertions and "explanations" of the literalist are unwarranted generalizations of his own inability to catch the immediately experienced quality of things. And it is his inability to find through them enhancement and enrichment in life, that makes him a nuisance to himself as well as to others. If man does not understand that his experience of a woman as a goddess is but a guidepost on his way toward the realization of his true nature, if he cannot abandon the husk of this image, he will become utterly lost and enmeshed in the contradictions of his own creations. The shallowness of his intellectualistic rationalizations will destroy the faintest vestige of value, because man believes that the verbalizations of religious experience are symbol-sentences or propositions, the meaning of which must be expanded or interpreted instead of being deepened and enriched.

---

[1] Sekoddeśaṭīkā, p. 56.

Now, the man and the goddess are two moulds in which reality as an indivisible whole expresses itself. There is a meaningful relationship between them. The goddess is not merely a poetic personalization or is directly felt as a message bearer. Rather it is a relationship like the one between the figures in a ballet. Standing aside and observing the interplay between man and goddess one has a feeling of how wonderfully the superhuman part is enacted and how realistic man is; how unsuspecting each is of his dependence on the other. When the one moves a complementary movement is seen in the other. When man tends to turn altogether too human, the goddess threatens him; when he unassumingly turns to her, she lovingly goes near him. Then all on a sudden the tableau is changing. The man slowly retreats and submits to the world given to the superhuman; the goddess displays her beauty in the world created by man. Identities are exchanged and recovered; the temporary partnership founded on the confusion of values dissolves into the permanent partnership of all living and non-living things. So does the feeling of wonder at the uniqueness of experience dissolve and merge into the still greater wonder of wholeness perceived. The goddess has become a bridge between man and nature, —and even between man and himself.

As the woman is the most appealing and significant center for the organization of external experiences, so the life functions, more particularly the sexual, afford the most powerful center for the organization of internal experiences. Sex love, its heights and its depths, its horrible darkness and its blinding light, is always present in the relationship between man and woman, whether we look at this relationship on the biological level or on the spiritual level. Moreover, the contrasts bound up with the woman, light and darkness, power and weakness, life and death, good and evil, becomes a natural vehicle for experession and embodiment of all sorts of value contrasts as they develop in the life of man. Through the woman the man experiences all that has been excluded from his world as well as all that has been experienced by all ages through the woman. Through her the man experiences the highest and deepest, the most overwhelming, and the most miraculous in life. This has been described most beautifully by Goethe in his "Faust" :

Highest mistress of the world !
Let me in the azure
Tent of Heaven, in light unfurled
Here thy Mystery measure !
Justify sweet thoughts that move
Breast of man to meet thee !
And with holy bliss of love
Bear him up to greet thee !
With unconquered courage we
Do thy bidding highest;
But at once shall gentle be,
When thou pacifiest.
Virgin, pure in brightest sheen,
Mother sweet, supernal,
Unto us Elected Queen,
Peer of Gods Eternal ![1]

The emotional realities, awesomeness poignancy, and sacredness, exist, and the experiencing of them is an essential element in man's adaptation to his environment. Man has several destinies, one of which is the biological, and his psychological adjustment to this destiny depends upon the feeling that he has about his biological neighbours. While the Karmamudrā essentially describes the biological situation where man has impoverished himself by being unaware of the wider relationships, the Jñānamudrā leads him out of the spatio-temporal process into that which transcends space and time. Through woman he is liberated from the tyranny of the senses and the sensuous. Thus the Jñānamudrā takes up an intermediate position. She makes man realize the biological background of the drama of human life in another light, and since through her the perception of wholeness will be effected, she is a balm to a mind divided against itself by the neurosi of war. She is an education in loving and an adventure in fulfilment, a search for still higher and more intense integrations. With the Jñānamudrā the integration of masculinity and feminity, of the human and the superhuman, has only temporarily been achieved, temporarily because the possibilities of this fusion have not been fully recognized and permanently realized. The feeling-emotional tone of this experience, which nevertheless is more valuable than the "real" values, is correctly likened to the sensation-complex of the orgasm, where, like in a flash, the narrow individuality is obliterated and merged into a more comprehensive relationship, similar to the desired awareness of wholeness. But at the very moment of culmination—the orgasm being an image taken from the narrower, more intuitible field of experience and used for expressions of more universal relations which cannot be expressed directly—the momentarily and unconsciously experienced wholeness relapses into the duality of the sexes. Therefore, to seek the Jñānamudrā and the joyous experience of her cannot be an end in itself. On the contrary, the way the Jñānamudrā is envisaged is but revelatory of emotional and other attitudes toward life and, in so far as these attitudes are evoked in us, there has been revealed to us something of the inner nature of man which to grasp is the final goal, lying beyond such constructions as the human and the superhuman.

---

[1] Goethe, Faust, part ii. English translation by Bayard Taylor. The German version runs as follows :

Höchste Herrscherin der Welt !
Lasse mich im blauen,
Ausgespannten Himmelszelt
Dein Geheimnis schauen.
Billige, was des Mannes Brust
Ernst und zart beweget
Und mit heilger Liebeslust
Dir entgegen träget.
Unbezwinglich unser Mut,
Wenn du hehr gebietest ;
Plötzlich mildert sich die Glut,
Wie du uns befriedest.
Jungfrau, rein im schönsten Sinn,
Mutter, Ehren würdig,
Uns erwählte Königin,
Göttern ebenbürtig.

The contrast between man's biological destiny (Karmamudrā) and his psychological adjustment to this destiny (Jñānamudrā), so to speak in a somewhat cool and abstract manner, should make man realize that he has to cope with most difficult problems. However, this does not mean that man stands between these problems, but that he himself is these problems at the same time. But while the fulfillment of man's biological destiny is rather easy, the psychological adjustment is of a more intricate nature. The experience of femininity comprises everything female. The man may experience his femininity through all female members of his family, leading to a multiplicity of projective images. Therefore it is not to be wondered at that this experience so often has an incestuous character. In the Buddhist texts the incestuous character is explicitly stated and this statement is ample proof of the fact that the authors of the Tantric texts had deep insight into the nature of man. Thus, Anaṅgavajra states that

> "The adept (*sādhaka*) who has sexual intercourse with his mother, his sister, his daughter, and his sister's daughter, will easily succeed in his striving for the ultimate goal (*tattvayoga*)".[1]

Similarly it has been stated in the Guhyasamājatantra that

---

[1] Anaṅgavajra, Prajñopâyaviniścayasiddhi V 25.

> "The adept who has sexual intercourse with his mother, his sister, and his daughter, goes toward highest perfection, which is the essence of Mahāyāna".[1]

It is of utmost importance how this incestuous character is conceived, whether man concretizes it and takes it at face value or recognizes it as a vehicle or medium of insight. The very fact that the experience of these contents, whether concretized or taken as symbols for something that cannot be expressed directly, creates blinding-illusions and distorts the relationship between the individuals as well as the one to oneself, is a grave danger. But there are men who will face any danger, because integration has become necessary for them. It is true we feel a kind of repugnance against the incestuous character of these experiences, but we should not forget that under the incest symbol the most subtle, most noble, most delicate, most chaste, but also the most unusual feelings are hidden,—all those feelings which contribute to the perplexing richness of human relationships and even provide them with coercive powers. He who wants integration, the attainment of wholeness, must take into account everything, however repugnant this may appear to him. He has to put up with reality without embellishments. He must become aware of all feminine aspects and must not choose one aspect or other from among the multiple aspects of femininity. Any arbitrary selection he makes leads him away from the attainment of wholeness, because t leads up to a morbid fixation. Since the perception of wholeness is to the Buddhist mind the most joyous of all human experiences, the statement that all women are to be loved suggests that all women are shadows, images, or moulds of the one real woman and can be, in a sense, shifted or interchanged for her service. It prevents mere fixed idolatry of one mould as if it were the origin of all. Every woman is to be loved and treated with awe, because there is behind her a many-sided mystery of femininity from which man through clinging to masculinity has separated himself and become a fragment. From this point of view we are able to understand the words of the Guhyasamājatantra,

---

[1] Guhyasamâjatantra (= Gaekwad's Oriental Series, vol. liii), p. 29

"All the women that are in the worlds he may enjoy in order to experience the Mahāmudrā".[1]

The process of integration is basically an initiation into the mysteries of what lies beyond the domain of consciousness linked up with the physical sex and of the artificially set up individuality. It begins with the personal sphere and then stretches beyond the personal into the superhuman. It is only the personal sphere that involves the incest motive. For in personal life the mother is the central figure and the most important and significant person any of us will ever know. The mother is the first woman the adolescent man meets on his way, through her he experiences something from which he has become alienated. The point I wish to make here is that. when in course of spiritual growth man experiences the Divine Mother (Jñānamudrā), the vision of the Divine Mother is not a deification of the mortal human mother, but that the attribute of motherliness is an exploiting of the memory of childish emotional experience in order to recapture the intenseness and directness of feeling. For this reason, the term incest is misleading and the mother fixation, defined in early psychoanalytic literature as an excessive erotic attachment of the son to the mother is a demential twist based on distorted reading of biology, history. anthropology or some other relatively rational discipline. Here we see most clearly what happens when a symbol is expanded and dissolved into something else. A psychological problem is distorted into a social one. A symbol is resolved into the non-symbolic instead of being developed and interpreted. The "physical" language with its spatial character, made to manipulate the bodily object, was transferred to the mental and made the psychological process unintelligible.

---

[1] Guhyasamâjatantra, p. 42.

Without discussing the details of the initiation process as far as rites are concerned I want to make clear one point in this connection. The question is who are those women that enable man to realize his true nature and to find the way toward integration? Normally, a man will gain the necessary insight into the nature of femininity through his own wife. But as is well known, in Hīnayāna Buddhism the female element as an integral part in the realization of wholeness had been excluded, although this did not mean that women were inferior beings. This exclusion of the female element from man's life was equal to a repression of femininity. Now, it is a well-known fact that repressed contents are dangerously explosive and, if allowed to remain repressed, will burst in revolutions and other callous deeds at the slightest shock. This observable fact induced modern psychiatry and social science to explain even religious phenomena in terms of catastrophisms or conflicts, personal or social. As far as religious changes are concerned this explanation holds good, though it does not explain the whole of religion or accounts for all the peculiarities of religious manifestations. The repression of femininity had produced a slow silting of the channels of wider participation by which the man had diminished himself. Therefore, the religious change which acknowledged the woman as indispensable for the realization of wholeness should be considered as a social revolution in the individual unconscious mind, as an escape from emotional isolation and as an attempt to reconstruct psychologically the shattered unity of life. The very fact that repressed contents remain undeveloped on a low level, because in the case of man and woman the over-evaluation of masculinity corresponds to an under-evaluation of femininity, as well as the very fact that the process of integration must start from the very bottom make the following statement intelligible :

"When he approaches a woman of the Caṇḍāla caste or a ḍombikā or a woman who comes from a base family, he attains perfection."[1]

The attempt to escape from the emotional isolation of a caste-ridden society and to bridge the gap between "high" masculinity and "low" femininity, I suspect, is also reflected in the following injunction that "Bhikṣus and Śramaṇas must make a Caṇḍālī their wife (if ever they want to go the way toward integration and wholeness.)"[2]

Whether the individual busies himself with the Karmamudrā or with the Jñānamudrā, in either case he has only partial knowledge of himself. But unless he has complete self-awareness, he cannot become master of his life and he will suffer from this lack of wholeness. And wholeness is never achieved, so long as the individual is subject to temptations, which arise because of his limitedness. It does not matter if these temptations come from the outside world to which the individual is drawn by his senses, or from the inner world which he becomes aware of through introspection or reflection. The phenomenal

---

1. Jñânasiddhi I 82.
2. Sekoddeśaṭikâ, pp. 28 sq.

content, external and internal, occupies the stage, but the true nature of man, the harmony of his many-sided possibilities, is not perceived in its essentiality. Man must fold up the phenomenal series, he must strip himself naked and escape from the boundaries of his apparent ego. He must full-heartedly give himself up to the supreme. The effort of him who seeks wholeness must and will be directed to the elimination of the hindrances, to the removal of the obscuring tendencies of ignorance (*avidyā*). The true human individual will pursue this ideal of perfection and wholeness with a devotion similar to that which he offers to an adored woman. However, our casual apprehensions and devotions do not reveal this highest reality, because they are backed by our wishes and prejudices and because knowledge pursued for the sake of power or fame does not take us far. Knowledge must be sought for attaining truth. It must be dispassionate. Only then it will lift man out of his narrow limits and make him forget himself in the awareness of wholeness. The emptying of the ego and of its world of contraries produces illumination and wisdom, that pure light by which we grow into our true being. Although this wisdom is always present and has only to be revealed, it will not be revealed so long as there is still the slightest vestige of an ego which sets up and keeps up the barrier between us and wholeness. Wholeness is grasped only when our mind is in complete resonance with the principle of life itself, that is, when we have attained that mysterious state that is beyond the dualism of ego and non-ego, of life and death. It is not mere passivity, although the quality of tranquillity is not absent, it is that state in which our mind has recovered its pureness of original motility. Normally, our mind is one-sided and fixed; it "stops" and deliberates and discriminates. Original mind, on the contrary, knows no stopping, no fixation, no deliberation, no discrimination. It pervades our whole being and is very much alive. There is nothing that might clog its flow. This state of original mind has been attained by the sages who have gone to the end of intellect and therefore no longer resort to it. They have got beyond the veil of the flesh, that is, consciousness united with our body, the objective world, and of the spirit, that is, subjective mind. They have no such interfering mediums as outside and inside. They do not cherish any egotistic thoughts nor do they have any consciousness of their own attainments. Entirely lifted out of their individualistic existence, including both the objective world and the subjective mind, they have become thoroughly pure and transparent, and from this position of infinite purity or transparency they look out to a world of multifarious objects though not dualistically. For as long as we harbour conceptual illusions arising from the separation of subject and object as final, our life is contaminated with dualism and sophistry. If we want to understand the world and man, we must understand them right away without resorting to wishful deliberations, without turning our head either this way or that. For when we are doing this, the object we have been seeking is no more there. Buddhism, through the practice of yoga, self-discipline, tries to find a point where no dualism in whatever form obtains. Having gone to the end of intellect means to have swept aside all conceptual scaffolds as something veiling our insight into the nature of life and reality. Yoga leads into a realm of Emptiness or Void (*śūnyatā*) where no conceptualism prevails, where a most refreshing breeze sweeps all over the ground where subject and object merge in one ineffable reality. Of this merging of subject and object, where our mind is kept perfectly unobstucted by anything, where we are able to look at the world and to admire its multiplicity, without, however stopping there, where, when we face the world, our whole being goes into it and feels every pulsation of it as if it were our own, Nāropa states as follows :[1]

"Here the terms *prajñā* and *jñāna* (cognition and knowledge), when explained successively, mean that our cognitive mind (*grāhakacitta*) and its cognizable object which is presented to (our cognitive mind) like a reflection in a mirror (*grâhyâdarśabhâsa*), (technically spoken of as the appearance of) an enemy's army and passing through ten stages beginning with smoke and so on, are mental processes (*sa eva*, i.e. our mind moving in subject-object relations), and that knowledge (*jñānam*) is (the vivid representation of this) complex condition (*grâhyacittam*), just as the reflection of one's own eye in a mirror is one's own cognizable eye. The merging of cognition and knowledge (into one Emptiness) means that, when the cognitive mind merges into the cognizable object, it does not busy itself with the external object. In the Yoga of six limbs, this is spoken of as withdrawing one's senses from the sensuous (*pratyāhāra*), meditation (*dhyāna*), controlling one's psychic powers (*prāṇāyāma*), steadying the mind (*dhāraṇa*), and merging (*majjana*). Out of this merging (of subject and object) there results the bliss of Nirvāṇa which is unceasing, our true nature (*sahaja*), non-mutable (*akṣara*) ; it is the fourth stage (of pleasure and joy), transcending (ordinary) pleasure (*bāla*), transport (*prauḍha*), and satiety (*spanda*, as experienced in the orgasm) ; though comparable to the world, it transcends the word and, therefore, it is called free from the modes of action of the three worlds. It is devoid of the dualism which attaches to such items (in love life and devotion) as smiling at each other, looking at each other, touching each other, embracing each other, taking each other by the hand; it is free from the impulsive and sustaining powers which manifest themselves as Karmamudrā and Jñānamudrā; its characteristic is that all the manifestations (of the worlds) have revealed themselves in their nature of *śūnyatā*."

---

[1] Sekoddeśaṭīkâ, p. 46, See also Advayavajra, pp. 38 sq.

With these words it has been stated most clearly that the goal is not some preconceived state or other to which our mind must be directed. Moreover the notion of *śūnyatā* or Emptiness tells us that there is absolutely nothing to which our mind might cling. He who wants to attain that state where he is no longer tortured by the antagonism of the opposites, must not meditate upon the basic unity of all things, where the differences and dissimilarities are obliterated and surrounded by the glory of a divine halo. Nor must he meditate upon the idea that even the most insignificant thing in this world sings the praise of God. Such ideas make our mind stop and cast unnatural fetters on it. They only aggravate the oppositions and limitations which confront every movement of ours, physical and psychological. For this reason, the goal is not a higher Self as ultimate reality in a world of separate entities. There is no God, no Soul, no Self, which might be embraced in despair, this symptom of psychological isolation from humanity and from the world. Buddhist contemplation is the opposite of dogmaticism, scientific or religious; it will assist us in freeing us from the fetters of conditioning.

It is, indeed, deeply ingrained in human nature to wish to throw off all the restraints we have put on us by ourselves and by environment, and once in a while, at least, to have free, and natural, and heart-to-heart intercourse with our fellow-beings, including the gods, the animals, the plants and even the inanimate objects so called. We welcome every opportunity for this kind of liberation. But this is possible only when we succeed in living in a "super-world" where no mutually excluding oppositions take place and when we throw our whole being into life and move along with it. Life is one integral and indivisible whole which has neither an outside nor an interior, neither a material nor a spiritual aspect which can be separated from life itself. Life moves in its complete oneness whether on the biological level or on the mental level as you may conceive it. Our rationalistic interpretation singling out only one aspect or another does not alter this fact. The Buddhist Tantras teach us to take hold of life in its wholeness and to move with it. They furthermore teach us that our nature is one with objective nature though not in the mathematical sense, but in the sense that nature lives in us and we in nature. In other words, masculinity and femininity are like man and nature, two abstractions carved from the one indivisible whole, inseparably connected with and interpenetrating each other, inserting themselves in and yet stretching beyond the individual. This interpenetration and expansion purposes to respect life, not to violate it or to utilize it for selfish ends. It is probably not going too far to say that this Buddhist feeling about the sacredness of life is opposite to the Western one which is mainly a feeling about the sacredness of one's individual life.

When the individual realizes that it will not do to busy oneself with the Karmamudrā, delegating to some undefined "Eternal Feminine", probably to a goddess somewhere, the function of values, and that it is equally unsatisfactory to hunt after a highly valuable phantom at the expense of the objective woman (for the most part), because both the Karmamudrā and the Jñānamudrā are creations of his mind, he will transcend these imageries and find wholeness. The initial step to and realization of wholeness is the Mahāmudrā, which has been described by Nāropa in the following way :

"The words "great" and "mudrā" together form the term Mahāmudrā (Great Mudrā). Her greatness consists in the fact that she is endowed with the glories of all qualities and values and that she is not restricted to one particular quality or value. She is called Mudrā, because she is marked (or sealed) by the adamantine nature of the enlightened mind (*mudryate*). The relationship (between her and the individual) is that there is freedom from constructions by one's own mind and that the yogin has a revelation of his own mind, when it has passed through the stages beginning with smoke and so on and when it is seen like an enemy's army".[1]

Similarly Advayavajra states that

"The words "great" and "mudrā" together form the term Mahāmudrā (Great Mudrā). She is not a something (*niḥsvabhāvā*) ; she is free from the veils which cover the cognizable object and so on; she shines forth like the serene sky at noon during autumn; she is the support of all success ; she is the identity of Saṁsāra and Nirvāṇa ; her body is Compassion (*karuṇā*) which is not restricted to a (single) object ; she is the uniqueness of Great Bliss (*mahāsukhaikarūpa*). Therefore it has been said that all phenomena are pleasant, if the mind does not go wild

---

1. Sekoldeśaṭīkā, p. 56.

and loose (*a-manasikāra*), and that all phenomena are unpleasant, if the mind goes wild and loose (*manasikāra*) :

> Praise be to thee who art free from conceptual constructions and from imagery, who dost not take up a hostile attitude toward anything (*apratiṣṭhitamānasa*), who needst not instate memory images, whose mind does not go wild and loose, who art without ideas of objects (*nirālamba*, nicht-objektbezogen).

This is what is called the Great Mudrā".[1]

When the individual experiences this state of the Mahāmudrā all the barriers imposed on his mind have been broken through. A sort of higher reality has been found, against which it is impossible to set up counter-arguments. The mind which has been emptied from what normally crowds into it and obscures its original purity and transparency, is capable of moving from one thing to another. This may sound strange, but the fact is that this sort of mind is not fixed on one thing or another and stops there, but that it can receive things from any quarter. When one is prepossessed of certain thoughts and ideas, one's mind is, to that extent, closed to other thoughts. When one is preoccupied one is unable to see even the most simple facts of life. But when one keeps one's mind open or empty one can take in all that comes to us. When our mind is not arrested and does not writhe with pain under the shackles we have put on it and when we do not cherish any thoughts as to the practical and worldly merit or demerit of our movements, we simply cannot take up a hostile attitude towards anything, because there is nothing that might impede the free movement of our mind. It is only the ego that fights against something and makes man hesitate in the choice of one point against another and, therefore, is so harmful to the mastery of the mind and to its attaining wholeness. Ever serene and unobstructed moves the mind. Nothing preconceived or mysterious is in it. And because the mind is free, the individual is liberated from all conditioning. Moreover, just because all artificial, human-made (and, therefore, most doubtful) props have been removed, the mind has found its real support and can safely be let alone. This support is life itself in all its richness and abundance, for apart from life nothing can exist. But better than any intellectual, refined, and sophisticated quibbles the similes used by the Buddhist sages can give us insight into this unconditioned reality.

---

[1] Advayavajra, Caturmudrā, p. 34.

"In the same way as the air moves everywhere, because it pervades everything, in the same way as it does not stop at anything and is free from (any distinct) marks, so also the knowledge of the Exalted One, comprising everything knowable, does not stop at anything (*na dharmapratiṣṭhita*) and is free from (any distinct) marks (i. e. it is not intellectual knowledge which emphasizes a certain content and suppresses everything else)
Therefore tradition states that

> By means of thy knowledge which is not linked up with a certain content, thou seest all fields and the life of all beings. Praise be to thee who art without ideas of objects.
>
> In the Jñānasiddhi the venerable Indrabhūti exclaims that
>
> In the same way as the air does not stop at anything, moves everywhere and is free from (any distinct marks), so also (this simile is used

> when) one speaks of ultimate reality, of peerless, adamantine knowledge.

Elsewhere it has been stated that

> In the same way as the air does not stop at anything, moves everywhere and is free from (any distinct) marks, so also the nature of ultimate reality cannot be shown (in the ordinary sense of the word), it has no (definite) form (i.e. our intellect tries to find a place where reality might be located and definitely spoken of, but by nature reality is unlimited and cannot be localized anywhere).

Or, it has been said that reality moves in the same way as the air (free and unobstructed) and because of its moving like the air it is Great Bliss (*mahasukhakāya*). Because it has neither colour nor form nor shape, the simile of the air is used. The meaning is that there is no deceptive appearance. It also has been stated that

> The nature (*kāya*) of all Buddhas is without deceptive appearances and without any props. It is unborn, uncreated, free from (such dialectical quibbles as) being and non-being"[1]

These examples, I think, are sufficient evidence for the fact that the experience symbolized by the Great Mudrā is not the attainment of some preconceived goal or other or whatever we may call it. On the contrary, all such fads together with their claims of miraculousness, secrecy, and authoritativeness are strictly refused, because they only serve as a means to enslave man. The very last thing expected is to believe in the Great Mudrā as eternal truth. The only total error in the world is the belief in total truth or, what is the same, in our prejudices and ideals as eternal values. Just because our ego cannot imagine any other values that would satisfy it, it does not mean that there are not any other values. But these other values are not an easy thing to learn, though they are something learnable. Our most consistent mistake is to think that because something has been valuable it will always be valuable; we fasten our attention exclusively upon the symbol and forget the context. We usually assume that there is something permanent, because we fail to realize that our personalities have changed more rapidly than our institutions which reflect our inner changes very inaccurately. The world will continue to be a mess as long as we think in rigid categories of good and evil. But if we succeed in lifting our spiritual myopia which makes us unable to clear away the debris of concepts and dogmas a new light will dawn upon us. Once within this light we seem to be able to understand the world with all its apparent endlessness of pluralities and entanglements. This light is not something demonstrable for which a confirmation by experiments or tests can be postulated. This light shines forth when all preconceived ideas have been cut off at the root. As long as we move in the circle of such contradictory notions as being and non-being, we are lost in utter darkness. It will not do to imprison the decisive experience into artificial and mechanical formulas. The Great Mudrā is a state of complete inner awareness, which is so difficult to be formulated in words, because it is not a light that one sees, but the light and freedom by which one sees and lives. Here the mind has been grasped in its uncontaminated originality and purity. The surface of the mind-mirror has been wiped clean, but, as a matter of fact, the mirror has never been obscured. Only because of such notions as being and non-being, one spirit, identity, egotistic commotions and so on, we have been compelled, as it were to set up a general sweeping operation. From the very beginning nothing has been withheld from us, only the folly and impertinence of our ego has made us unable to see what we have been from the outset and what we really are, because it was content with believing that its self-imposed limitations had been the only values since the dawn of time. And since our ancestors had lived, and lived nobly, by these same fancied and limited values, transmitted from one generation to the other, our ego has even been satisfied with all second-hand elaborations, the rationalizations of other men's experiences. Buddhism is strongly opposed to such distortions of experience, it postulates direct experience without any interfering mediums and it exhibits an astonishing diffidence with regard to rational communication of such experiences.

---

[1] Sekoddeśaṭīkā, pp. 58 sq.

That from which everything starts and, according to the varying conditions which it may require, assumes individual shape, is the Dharmakāya, the Buddha-nature of all that exists. This primal cause, which is not so much an answer to the riddle of the universe but the verbalization of what has been discovered by intense experiences, is also called the "unity of opposites" (*yuganaddhakāya*). Nāropa, for instance, states that

"Because its essence is the nature of all Buddhas, its true nature, being the non-duality of the two truths (i.e. of "literal" truth (*saṃvṛtisatya*) and "symbolic" truth (*paramārthasatya*), is spoken of as the unity of opposites (*yuganaddhâkhya*). For this reason, the unity of opposites (*yuganaddhakâya*) is the true nature of all that exists (*dharmakâya*)".[1]

---

[1] Sekoddeśaṭīkā, p. 57.

Similarly Advayavajra exclaims that

> "Because it is not a something, it has no origin; because it manifests itself under (ever-changing) conditions, it does not come to an end. For this reason, being and non-being do not exist (separately and per se), but appear coupled together (*yuganaddha*).
>
> "The oneness of the Void (*śūnyatâ*) and Compassion (*kṛpā*) is not an intellectual problem (but the verbalization of an experience). The Void and its Manifestation are by nature coupled together (*yuganaddhatā*)".[1]

From the Western point of view, the outcome of these statements is the recognition of the fact that in all walks of life our "knowledge" is both "literal" and "symbolic" and that the idea of symbolic knowledge is meaningless except as contrasted with knowledge which is non-symbolic in this sense and vice versa. However, in stating this we are on the brink of losing sight of the experience itself and of falling into the semantic error committed by philosophers and theologians of all creeds who piled abstraction upon abstraction and system upon system, in trying to rationalize their beliefs. There is a continuous tradition from Plato and Philo, through Origen and Clement, Augustine and Neo-Platonism, up to its complete statement in mediaeval times. The epistemology of Christian thought, having its root in Hellenic thought, consists in treating such statements as the above mentioned ones as symbol-sentences or propositions, the meaning of which must be interpreted. The epistemology of Buddhism is, on the contrary, not to resort to the mediumship of concepts and abstractions but to treat these statements as guideposts to gaining similar, if not the same, experiences. The Buddhists did not try to dissolve symbols into something else, because they did not forget that symbols were symbols and explicit references to psychological realities. Thus, instead of translating religious utterances into metaphysical terms of higher generality and of getting lost in absurdities of interpretation, they avoided the danger of getting themselves tied up in a knot of their own making. They gained freedom which provided the emotional radiations within the conceptual vacuum of liberation, Nirvāṇa. To the Buddhist the clearing off of all conceptual scaffolds as unnatural fetters of the mind is imperative. Only from the Buddhist point of view such statement as the following one is intelligible :

---

[1] Advayavajra, Yuganaddhaprakāśa, p 49:
*naiḥ svâbhâvyâd ajâtatvaṁ pratyayâd aniruddhatâ*
*bhâvâbhâvâv ato na sto yuganaddhaṁ tu bhâsate*
*śūnyatâkṛpayor aikyaṁ vidheyaṁ na svakalpataḥ*
*śūnyatâyâḥ prakâśasya prakṛtyâ yuganaddhatâ*

> "Radiant by nature are all phenomena, pure from the very beginning, and uncontaminated. There is no enlightenment, no Buddhahood, no individual self as any kind of value, no life".[1]

These negations, to be sure, are, disconcerting, and yet beneath all these verbalizations there is a most important affirmation. Life, like disease or death, is an abstraction. In reality there are no such things as life, death, enlightenment, and so on. Indulging in abstractions does not solve the problem of man. It only leads to new abstractions and to the creation of new needs, so that new gadgets can be sold to the masses. The Western era of slogans is the best example of hide-and-seek between discovery and disaster, between gigantic verbiage and abysmal spiritual hollowness.

---

[1] Jñānasiddhi, p. 84 :
*prakṛtyâbhâsvarâ dharmâ âdiśuddhâ hy anâvilâḥ*
*na bodhir nâpi buddhatvaṁ na sattvo nâpi jīvatâ*

Normally, outside the domain of the intellect, nothing is clearly definable. But the elusiveness of a thing does not signify its non-existence. When we sail in dense fog, the invisible rocks are none the less present. From time to time they emerge menacingly from the white mist and are at once swallowed up again. To this fleeting phenomenon the experiences of the Karmamudrā and of the Jñānamudrā can be truthfully compared. Moving in the dense fog of our "literal" knowledge we sometimes become aware of "symbolic" knowledge. But when we experience the Great Mudrā all of life and the world is stretched out before our eyes. We see every bit of it and everything we see we feel, and we feel it much more strongly than in any normal state of consciousness. We are not excluded from anything by having locked ourselves up in some sheltered place of our mind. Everything stands out sharply, with luminosity rather than clarity. We move restlessly with the objects or yet we stay quietly with them, just as we like. We are extremely happy because nothing can hurt us, because we have no enemies.

This state of bliss is called the Phalamudrā. It has been described by Nāropa in the following manner :

"The Phalamudrā is the bliss of the Great Mudrā. Her characteristic is the awareness of most intense and inexhaustible (immutable) bliss (*paramākṣarasukhajñāna*). All the time She carries with her joy (*ratiṁ*), because the previous achievement (of the Great Mudrā) has become an immutable (and inalienable) possession. For this reason She is called Mudrā. Her greatness consists in the greatness of abandonment and in the greatness of aquirement.

The greatness of abandonment is that the lucidity of one's own nature, characterized as that state in which all the tendencies (*vāsanā*) and all the veils obscuring reality (*āvaraṇa*) are abandoned, is becoming realized (through this very abandonment (*sākṣātkaraṇa*) ). The greatness of acquirement is that the unity of opposites (*yuganaddha*), characterized as purity and as the very nature of all Buddhas, has been realized (*sākṣātkāra*). The realization of lucidity, which, because all the obscurations and all the fogginess of thinking have vanished, is comparable with the (cloudless) sky and whose fundamental feeling-emotional tone (*rasa*) is that we can only say "void" (*śūnya*, and nothing further), indeed, is the acquirement of the very nature of all Buddhas. Here the qualities of all Buddhas are met with in their creative power (*śaktirūpeṇa*) to achieve everything. For this reason, the basic support of all phenomena is called Dharmakāya, ehe Buddha-nature of all that exists"[1].

The realization of man's true nature lifts him out of his dependence on things and leads him into a realm beyond his meager ken. It breaks down the forbidding walls of accident and entropy, these gloom-spots in Western philosophy. It does away with the illusions of life and death. For the illusion of life is the delusion of private immortality, and the illusion of death is the superstition that we can cheat death when it comes, by giving up life—preferably that of someone else. When wholeness has been achieved we wander freely wherever we like, without bitterness or despair. We will not be bothered by any such problems as matter and spirit, for these crop up only when we lose sight of the whole and, in emphasizing the emotional significance of certain aspects in life, dim the realization of the spirituality of all life and even of the implicit spirituality of all matter. Man's spirit, beyond all limitations, ever serene and free in its movements, constantly manifests itself through the medium in which it operates. Besides the activities it usually displays, it possesses others, generally hidden, but capable of becoming actual in response to certain changes of the medium. If there be nothing else but the hereditary tendencies of cells and of men (*vāsanā*), all striving would be illusory. Man would never be able to throw off his fetters, and it is just the same if we call these fetters material or spiritual fetters. Let us destroy all the barriers we put up between the whole and ourselves, for it is only when they are removed that we become aware of the whole and live with it. Let us make a clean sweep and throw up our semantic errors, for then we are in a position to understand that the spirit is not the spirit. And when the conceptual scaffolds have been removed, all of a sudden we know what is the essence of the spirit.

---

[1] Sekoddeśaṭīkā, pp. 56 sq.

> "You should conceive the spirit as similar to the sky, (that is to say,) you should conceive the spirit as of the same nature as the sky. When you have turned your thinking-operations into nonthinking-operations (i. e. when you do not harp on any ideas but let your mind move free and unobstructed), unsurpassable enlightenment will be achieved".[1])

Here it has been said explicitly that man's spirit, the Void (*śūnyatā*), or whatever we may call this decisive experience, is not a goal in the sense of a support to which we may cling. The Void must be traversed from end to end in order to find unconditioned freedom. Freedom means purity of mind and of heart in all walks of life. From the very beginning mind has been pure and free, but since the awakening of the intellect it has been working under the restrictions imposed on it by relative affirmation and negation. All our being cries out for freedom, but we shall never succeed in living a life of freedom, if we do not cut off our intellect at the root. Our intellect and our discursive reasoning have never been a very reliable standard of judgment. Moving in logical dichotomies and utilizing the contents of consciousness only, husbanding them for the narrow range of dealings with the phenomenal world, the intellect cannot understand to what degree ideas, which appear remote and mysterious, dark and inscrutable to it, may be important for man's life. It cannot understand that these ideas may be but inadequate verbalizations of something sublime which, though it transcends the limits set up by our reason, is in fact worthwhile to be striven after with assiduity. Our intellect has never been concerned with the life and the growth of the individual. In spite of its undoubtedly enormous achievements in the field of distinction and cognizance as far as the outside world is concerned, it has always been dumbfounded whenever actual life in the true sense of the word demanded its rights. It has never found the paths that lead toward a wider field of experience and reality. Ever and again we have been compelled to admit that we have come to our wit's end. Our spiritual needs have never been satisfied by the intellect. Therefore it is absolutely necessary to remove all the dust and dirt which has accumulated in course of time and to doubt the validity of the premises which have altogether too hastily been taken for granted. But if we have succeeded in cleaning the mirror of the mind we must not harbour any thoughts as to its purity, otherwise the mirror will become cloudy again and once more we relapse into impurity. We must give up ourselves to the whole without any egotistic remainders. In the same way as the sky looks blue from a distance, but the nearer and deeper we move into it the more we become aware of the fact that it is not at all coloured, so also man's nature as a whole, when looked at from a distance, appears as a turmoil of contradictory notions, but as soon as we give ourselves up to it whole-heartedly we will find peace, serenity, and lucidity.

---

[1] **Saraha (after verse 44, in Tibetan only):**
*sems ni nam-mkhai ḥdra-bar bzuṅ-bya-ste*
*nam-mkhai raṅ-bzin-ñid-du sems bzuṅ-bya*
*yid de yid-ma-yin-par byed-ḥgyur-na*
*des ni bla-med byaṅ-chub thob-par ḥgyur*

> "The longer you look at the sky, clear from the very beginning, the more your view is dimmed. (In exactly the same way) the true nature of man (*de-lta-bu-ñid*=*tathatā*) is obscured in course of time.
>
> The fool is led astray by the errors of his own thinking".[1]

In another place we read that

"If the mind is fettered, man is fettered, if the mind is free, man is free. There is no doubt about that. Through the very force by which the fool is fettered. the sage is set free".[2])

---

[1] Saraha 36 (according to the Tibetan translation):
*gdod-nas dag-pa nam-mkhai raṅ-bzin-la*
*bltas-śiṅ bltas-śiṅ mthoṅ-ba ḥgags-par ḥgyur*
*de-lta-bu-ñid dus-su ḥgog-par ḥgyur*
*gñug-ma yid-la skyon-gyis byis-pa bslus*

[2] Saraha 44:
*citte bajjhe bajjhaī mukhe mukkeī ṇatthi sandeho*
*bajjhanti jeṇa vi jaḍâ lahu parimuccanti teṇa vi buhâ*

However, life has been mapped out so clearly by the intellect and its dualistic mode of thinking that it seems to be the best course to follow its dictation without reserve and to take its false glitter for reality. But the more we become entangled in its snares the weaker we grow. More and more we deviate from life-giving reality. Intolerable suffering is our lot. Human reasoning is not the last thing. Buddhism wants to raze to the ground this stronghold of hybris, illusion, and delusion. The Buddhist sages knew too well that mere intellectual thinking is only patchwork and that it unceasingly breeds distress and irresponsibility. It destroys true moral sense, for what we call morality is but the application of our intellect to our life in the outside world. It is bolstered up by a sense of rightness which provides the foundation for Western imperialism and for every form of class-exploitation as well as for the invariably righteous wars constantly waged against one another. The silly rigmarole of sin and virtue, of good and evil, is a scourge of this dualistic mode of intellectual thinking. He who believes in rigid categories of good and evil and constantly harps on sin must become a sinner—there is no other way for him. On the other hand, he who clings to virtue should become a virtuous man, because the same law of identification obtains Unfortunately the accepted cultural standard of modern societies does not allow this course. Where gangsters and criminals are protected by politicians and respected by

---

See also Saraha 30:

"In every home one speaks of purity, but one does not know where Great Bliss resides. Saraha declares that the world is fettered by the mind and none comprehends the state called no-mindness."

*gharê gharê kahiaï sojjhuka kahaṇâ*
*ṇaü para munia mahâsuha-ṭhâṇâ*
*Saraha bhaṇaï jaga cittē bâhiâ*
*so acitta ṇaū keṇa bi gahia*

judges and where the cult of self is so important that excesses of self-worship are easily forgiven at the expense of others—unselfishness seems slightly unclean and a sign of weak-mindedness. Obviously the modern societies can only thrive in the company of filthy people. They have delegated to some undefined authority, somewhere in heaven, all that is good, leaving them free to think, and even to act like beasts, without feeling like beasts. The dark aspects of human nature they have completely absorbed and identified themselves with it. Out of it they have constructed the doctrine of sin, of the original sin, and of malice of the human heart. Making loud propaganda for these delightful things they would not rest until the whole world is a place fit for a scavenger. They have constantly been at work to lower man's sense of his own dignity. There is a deep gap between Buddhism and Christianity. Sin and virtue, good and evil, are fateful delusions of a half-baked mind and have nothing to do with reality. Buddhism detests all such obsessional ideas, because they weaken man and strike him with a mortal disease. Buddhism wants to preserve life in its integrity. Therefore, applied to life it is a technique of orientation rather than a statement of revealed truth and its inherent despotism. All it has to say is meant to serve as a guidepost ; it is not meant as a doctrine in the sense that it is legitimate and even beneficent for one human group to impose its rule on another by force. The guidepost idea is clearly expressed in the following words :

"It is beyond (such notions as) colour and quality, beyond words and comparisons. If I speak about what cannot be expressed in words, (my words are to be understood) as suggestions. Who can show the Supreme Lord (and say that He is this or that and nothing else)? (To do so would be as stupid as) to speak about a virgin's delight in sexual intercourse!"[1]

If words are understood as suggestions to seek and to find one's own way they are very useful, but if they are taken as mystic realities they are most harmful. They have nothing to say any more and become the incomprehensible gibberish of a dejected mind.

"The instruction by the teacher is nectar. He who does not drink quickly will die of thirst in the desert of innumerable explanations and doctrines."[2]

The final realization of wholeness, where the Mahāmudrā and the Phalamudrā merge together, is called Sahaja. This word can hardly be translated into any European language, simply because of the fact that it is the verbal expression of an experience that has been more or less unknown to the Western mind. Taught to believe strictly in some printed pages and narrowly watched by the auricular confession, the Western man was prevented from making experiences of his own and from widening his outlook of life. Those few who dared to gain experiences of their own and were unwilling to partake in the blasphemy of a totalitarian system were cruelly persecuted. Thus, the discovery of what man really is was made almost impossible. The words of those who had such a religious experience as the one spoken of in the Buddhist texts have become unintelligible and, in course of time, having a religious experience was considered out-of-date. Indeed, the impression many of us have that religious experience is anachronistic, is basically due to the fact that the only religious idiom available to us is an archaic one, no longer suited to our emotional and intellectual requirements. Our minds have become adverse to accepting at their face value all the grotesque and often sinister superstitions of a given creed; they have equally become opposed to acknowledging that what someone is talking about may be something important—something important to the listener as well as to the speaker. Such an important emotional reality is the Sahaja which, literally translated, means "born with." To call the decisive experience by this name is most opportune, because it makes us see that what is hinted at by this word is *living* in every individual and can be discovered by him. As a matter of fact, it will be discovered when the debris of myth and prejudice which obstructs the study of man is cleared away, when all veils are torn—the thickest veil being the intellectual creed of nothingbutism. When man is lifted out of his subjective and objective existence he will be free and able to see the whole universe, including himself, as an undivided and indivisible whole. He will realize that it is not religion that is out-of-date but the dualmonarchy pattern of his personality structure. He will understand that what is called soul—the spiritualized conscious personality—is an illusion which involves him so deeply in the problem of his own salvation that he forgets his fellows, and which makes him despise his body compounded of dust so that not only the end of life but the whole experience of life seems mean and ignominous to him. He will understand that dust is as admirable as his soul, because it is but another aspect of wholeness. But as long as he moves in the dualism of matter and spirit he wears himself out like a machine which will eventually fall into bits of rust. As long as man is diverted from the whole, either by matter or by spirit, he will be frustrated and suffer. But when the whole is stretched out before his eyes, when nothing is hidden from him, what then is the meaning of the past and of the future?

---

[1] Saraha 60:
*akkharabaṇṇo para-guṇa-rahiye*
*bhamaī ṇa jâṇaī so maī kahiye*
*so paramesaru kâsu hahijjai*
*suraa kumârī jimahu paḍijjaī*

[2] Saraha 58:
*guru-ubaesaha amia-rasu hahbahī ṇa pīaū jehi*
*bahu-satthattha-marutthalihi tisie mariaū tehi*

"There is nothing that might be called a something (and we can only say) "void" (*śūnya*). The fact (that we can only say "void" when we have broken through the narrow circle in which our intellect moves and into which something beyond this circle enters like a comet; thus proving that the circle of our intellect is, indeed, very narrow) is the Void (*śūnyatā*). The past and the future are void (i. e. they are not a something), and this view (An-schauung) is the Void. It is of abysmal depth and of towering sublimeness. Of abysmal depth, because the past and the future do not exist per se (i. e. no remembrance and no hope can disprove life as it is lived at this very moment); of towering sublimeness, because the past and the future are seen (and apprehended in the unique moment of the present). This apprehension which is characterized as the Void and which takes hold of the Void is called "Liberation through the Void" (*śūnyatā-vimokṣa*). Purified by it, because the fourth state (of the Upaniṣads, in which man is identified with the Brahman—identification not being life but paralyzation in darkness) has been overcome, the Immutable (*akṣara*), Great Bliss, is present. This apprehension, comparable with a diamond (*jñānavajra*), is Compassion (*karuṇā*), (for Compassion means that) bliss (*kaṁ*) is checked (*ruṇaddhi*). This is the

Sahaja, the gain consisting in (infinite) wisdom and activity (*prajñopāyātmaka*) and purity (*viśuddha*)".[1]

The Immutable (*akṣara*) is nothing eternal as opposed to something transient. It means that nothing is moving when man's spirit,—usually moving restlessly—and under varying conditions, assuming various shapes, does not move. The Immutable is the tranquillity of the unmoved in the uproar of the moved, for the moved and the unmoved cannot be separated from each other. When one has become the Immutable one is intensely quiet, there is deep silence all around and within but this silence is the most golden music. The whole universe moves in its complete oneness restlessly or serenely as one may conceive it.

The calm stream of life, beyond discriminating reason, has nothing to do with any calculations we make as to the effects of our doings either on others or on ourselves. It is not concerned either with thoughts of gain, merit, or consequence. Such ideas are something we read into certain forms of movement and by which we become wretched slaves to the outer conditions of life. Since the beginningless past the waves have been rolling in the ocean, the snow-covered peaks of the mountains have stood pure and high against the sky. Is there any visible purpose in it ? Obsessed with utilitarian ideas we strive for selfish gains totally ignorant of and careless about how much misery we inflict on others. We can discuss coolly a proposal for condemning several hundred or millions of harmless men to torture and death on the vague chance that there might be some profit in it and benefit to us. We kill the whole world and do not see that we diminish ourselves when we take the life of other creatures. There is no love in us; we are possessed with a desire for brutal power. Love, indeed, is something momentary and ever-fleeting and, if it is not appreciated while it is fully charged with life, it becomes a faint memory or an unrealizable hope. Its liveliness is entirely lost. Love is life itself. For it there is no past, no future, but the present. We hesitate, we turn our head, and there is no more love. Our mind stops and its original purity is stained.

---

[1] Sekoddeśaṭīkā, p. 5.

"An image (*nimitta*), the Buddha, enlightenment and other notions are discriminating and imagining activities of the mind. This activity is the motive (*hetu*) (for the fact that the spirit assumes different shapes). But since all that can be said is "the Void" (*śūnyatā*), there is (in reality) no motive (which is a construction of our mind). For this reason, there is no image either (which might be the abode of the mind; in other words, mind cannot be localized anywhere and we must get rid even of such notions as mind and matter). This inner awareness that there is no image is "Imageless Liberation" (*animitta-vimokṣa*). This (empty) mind is the adamantine nature of mind (*cittavajra*), because it is swept clear (from all conceptual fetters) by the very fact that the state of deep sleep (described in the Upaniṣads and where all our forces wear themselves out in diastolic and systolic movements, because they are not gathered in the one reservoir of all powers and energy) has been overcome; because it is free from the conceptual dualism as expressed by eternity and non-eternity; because its very nature is love (*maitryātmaka*) (i.e., true love is selfless and without any preconceived ideas. For as long as there are still egotistic commotions love is impossible. What we call love is tainted by the desire for possession and dominance); because it fills the world with bliss through manifesting itself in the two bodies (of the Sambhogakāya and of the Nirmāṇakāya); and because it is free from all thought-constructions (which belong to the sphere of the ego and make us read utilitarian ideas into the movement of things). This is the spirit of all that exists (*dharmakāya*). This is the true nature of all things, consisting in (infinite) wisdom and activity (*prajñopāyātmako dharmātmā yoga*)"[1]

It is only a concession to our intellectual mode of speaking when the notion of motive is introduced. As a matter of fact, in the sphere which lies beyond the realm of consciousness, where space, time, and causality obtain, all such distinctions are impossible. Although we are inclined to overevaluate consciousness we should never forget that consciousness is not all and that beyond its world there are vast and unknown regions which nevertheless give a certain colour to our thoughts, our emotions, our actions, to all our life, even if we do not clearly realize their hidden power. Therefore, to say that these regions are outside consciousness or separate from it is absolutely incorrect. These vast and unknown regions are within us, that is, we are these regions, also. Only our ignorance (*avidyā*), our one-sidedness has made us oblivious of them and created in us the impression that they are outside and separate from us.

Man's true nature is completeness. This means entireness, perfection, fulfillment and satisfaction, without deficiency, lack, or inability. That which is complete is one undivided and an indivisible whole, to which nothing can be added and from which nothing can be taken. It undergoes neither fluctuation nor variation, neither augmentation nor depletion. For this reason, I prefer to speak of completeness rather than of perfection, which is involved in completeness. Moreover, the term perfection has been misused too frequently. We are accustomed to speak of a man as a "perfect" specimen of the human race when he has developed some arbitrarily selected ability at the expense of his many other abilities. Completeness, however, is something rare and most precious. In most cases, it is overlooked, because our cultural pattern favours one-sidedness and the development of highly specalized types. A man who is more than what society expects from him is more or less an uncertain person. He is different from the crowd and baffles all calculations. And yet everyone yearns for being a "more", because he somehow has an inkling of the fact that his existence means far more than economic welfare, sordid gain, or pleasure-hunting, and that it gains its meaning when it is connected with something far more enduring and all-sustaining. Segmental behaviour is possible for certain ends only, but it cannot continue to dominate the whole without damage to the core of what man is. Therefore, man must try to throw off the self-imposed fetters of his one-sidedness and to bring to light all that is in him. As a matter of fact, man can throw off his fetters, because they are comparable with dirt on a mirror. Nobody hesitates to clean a mirror. Why, then, should we hesitate to liberate ourselves from what is too narrow for us and does not fit us. We have an inkling of the fact that we are not altogether compressed within the dimensions of the cosmos created by the genius of our scientists, that we extend somewhere else, into a world which, although enclosed within ourselves, stretches beyond space and time. Such, indeed, is our universe. Why, then, shall we not realize it ?

---

[1] Sekoddeśaṭīkā, p. 5.

We say that the moon waxes or wanes, according as her own shadow decreases or increases, but, in fact, the moon is the same all the time. "There is neither decrease nor increase. But, although the moon is full all the time, we say that the moon wanes or waxes, according as she is covered with darkness or as darkness goes away[1]". It is the same with what man really is, what the whole universe is. Our interpretation conceives it as being or non-being. But in reality it is both or, stated more correctly being and non-being are abstractions of our own creation. And those abstractions, after they have been added together, are still less rich than reality. They leave behind them a residue, too important to be neglected. Man and the universe, as known to the specialists, is far from being the real man, the real universe. They are nothing but schemata, consisting of other schemata built up by the techniques of each science. But when man passionately seeks the principle of all things, when he flings away his abstractions, because he has learned that they are insufficient, enmeshing him in a something, then he will find his true nature. And this nature, being wholeness, will manifest itself like the light of the full moon when her own shadow vanishes.

> "This universe is not a something (*niḥsvabhāva*); it is the one which (our various techniques divide into) being and non-being[2]". And, furthermore.
>
> "Constantly it rises with the Enlightened Ones. It does not rise with those whose mind is stained with ignorance".[3]

---

[1] Sekoddeśaṭīkā, p. 62: *na tasya chedaḥ pūraṇaṁ vâ sa hi nitya-pūrṇo 'pi tamaḥpidhânâpidhânâbhyâṁ kṣīṇaḥ purṇaś ca vyavahrīyate.*

[2] Sekoddeśaṭīkā, p. 62:

*niḥsvabhāvam idaṁ viśvaṁ bhāvābhāvaikalakṣaṇaṁ*

[3] Sekoddeśaṭīkā, p. 62:

*nityoditaṁ tu buddhānāṁ nāvidyāduṣṭacetasām*

Viewed from our ego, drawing near and withdrawing from what we are in reality, the universe, our own nature, appears either open or closed to us. For when, in the daily struggle for existence, our attention is attracted by the outside world, all that is in us is obscured, but when we listen to and follow its voice unexplainable happiness and ineffable bliss is waiting for us. We have everything, for we are everything. Thus, Saraha exclaims that

> "Victorious is the Prince, who is bliss, unique, causeless, and who constantly rises in this world. But if one tried to speak of Him in words, even the Omniscient One would be speechless[1]".

Completeness, entireness, beyond all words and concepts, has been present from the very beginning, though unrealized. It only seems as if it grows till at last it will be plucked and enjoyed like a ripe fruit. However, the fruit is not different from the tree or from the seed out of which it through various stages developed. Cause and effect are one and the same.

"The universe (the image (*bimba*) of which) comprises all aspects and forms and is born out of the Void (*śūnya*), (comparable with) the (transparent) sky (and by nature the Void), is the cause (*hetu*, *kāraṇa*). Bliss (*sukha*) which originates in the Immutable (*akṣara*), (comparable with ) the *śukra* (i. e. lucid energy thought of as male activity and, according to ordinary peoples' view, the sperma), is the effect (*phala*). For what reason is bliss determined as effect the nature of which is perfect (and unconditioned) bliss ? (The reason is that) perfect (and unconditioned)

---

[1] Sekoddeśaṭīkā, p. 63 :

*jayati sukharāja ekaḥ kāraṇarahitaḥ sadodito jagatām-*
*yasya ca nigadanasamaye vacanadaridro babhūva sarvajñaḥ*

bliss is determined by just the same cause, because (bliss) is the Void without ideas of objects (*nirālambaśūnyatātmakatyāt*) This is the non-duality, known as the Void and the Great Compassion (*śūnyatākaruṇā*). The Void signifies that the mind (*citta*), representing the universe and being the Void appearing as an object, is the cause, and that the mind, representing the Immutable and being the Great Compassion (*śūnyatākaruṇā*)—not troubled by ideas of objects, is the effect. The non-separateness of the Void and of the Great Compassion is enlightenment (*bodhicitta*). It is oneness. This is called the non-losable (*acyuta*). It is different with what has been brought about by (the relationships between man and the whole, symbolized by) the Karmamudrā and the Jñānamudrā, which transient and used up in the orgasm. (Enlightenment) is free from (the opposites of) annihilation (*nirvāṇa*) and the bustle of the world (*saṁsāra*). Thus (the author of the Kālacakratantra) has stated. The universe (seen like an image in a mirror, *bimba*) is untrammeled by a sterile Nirvāna; the Immutable (*akṣura*), being perfect (and unconditioned) Great Bliss, is beyond the bustle of the world which yields but transient joy and pleasure. The union of the Immutable (*akṣara*) with the universe (*bimba*) is non-duality, it is the unsurpassable, the sublime[1]".

When this unique oneness has been realized, we have found ourselves. No longer do we represent a basically schizophrenic personality, split into at least two mutually inhibitive tendencies. The rational and irrational components of our being have met. The isolation of either component has been done away with. Indeed, it has been our isolation that made us lose sight of the facts of life and induced us to treat life as a sort of metaphysical proposition. Nothing has been gained by such a procedure, on the contrary, we have lost everything, for, while we were attached to the one side of our being, the other side attacked us and broke down what we had built up with painstaking care. But now harmony has been attained. To be in complete resonance with life is called Samādhi, and only in Samādhi the Sahaja can be realized. Samādhi has often been translated with "concentration", but Buddhist "concentration" is different from Occidental concentration. There is no God, no soul, no eternity, no life after death, which might be an object of concentration and meditation. Its nature is absolute purposelessness. A man who has attained Samādhi is totally changed. He has become a sage, an enlightened one. He has not made just an exercise of his mental abilities and remained as sterile as before. Therefore, he who wants to gain freedom of mind must not resort to some proposition or other, however sublime it may appear to him. He must stop this self-deception.

---

[1] Sekoddeśaṭīkā, p. 70.

> "The Yogin must not concentrate his mind on the Void; he must not concentrate his mind on the non-Void either. He must not give up the Void; he must not give up the non-Void either.
>
> "If one is attached to the Void or to the non-Void. many troublesome thoughts arise. If one gets rid of (what seems to be a support of our mind), all troublesome thoughts disappear. Therefore, both (reasoning as regards the Void and the non-Void) has to be given up[1]".

Here it has been stated explicitly that Buddhist

---

[1] Prajñopāyaviniścayasiddhi IV 5-6.

"concentration" is not a concentration of the mind on certain things which are not immediately connected with life. Buddhist Samādhi is the most serious task. It is life itself. Every attempt to run away from it will remain a failure.

Most people are content with what they have gained by reasoning. This intellectual knowledge, which is the outcome of observation and experiment, analysis and even speculation, is called "literal" knowledge (*saṁvṛtisatya*) and corresponds to our common sense which, however, is always flat and uninspiring. Here it does not matter if the significance of objects is emphasized to such a degree that the external objects have a pronounced hold over man and that man's acceptance of the logic of events outside himself may lead to a certain fixity or rigidity of life organization which prevents sympathy and understanding of his own emotions and feelings, and those of others, or if man's personality is marked by ideational patterns which have been almost completely organized subjectively till they suit the individual and make him indifferent towards the objective world or dominate his perception of the outside world that the given perception is always recast into predetermined patterns or meanings of his own. In either case, the individual moves in the logical dichotomies of subject and object and the hybris of his ego will inevitably violate either the objective or subjective reality. But there is still another sort of knowledge which defies all logical dissections and explanations and moves in the rhythmic moving of the spirit. This knowledge penetrates deeply down to the very foundations of our existence or, to state it more correctly, it emerges from the depths of our own being. This knowledge, which is called "symbolic", "transcandental" knowledge (*paramārthasatya*), is much more convincing, because it has come out of the whole and because it can give an answer where our hearsay knowledge and "literal" knowledge fail to give an answer. It makes us free, so that all worries, all miseries, and all conflicts going on in this world cease to affect the individual. This knowledge is neither conceptual nor philosophical but quite real and direct, vital and energizing. Unlike intellection it does not block its own passageway. As long as there is still the faintest vestige of an ego we are limited and do not possess the freedom of mind. The dualism of subject and object must be transcended, if ever freedom shall be our own.

> "If one gives up both extremes (the extreme of the Void and the extreme of the non-Void), one is set free The idea of an ego has no longer any support. For this reason the dualistic mode (of thinking, which always enslaves us) must be given up[1]".

Since, as I have already pointed out, Buddhist Samādhi is not an abstraction or an intellectual exercise, it is obvious that Samādhi has been attained when "symbolic" knowledge is coupled with "literal" knowledge, when life has been realized as an integral and indivisible whole. We are no longer disunited with ourselves, we have found and realized unitive knowledge. We are the masters of reality and possess the key to all the mysteries of life.

"Reality is the only thing that counts. What then. O Exalted One, is the meaning of reality? Reality is that against which there are no counter-arguments. What is the meaning of that against which there are no counter-arguments? Samādhi, leading up to reality, is that against which there are no counter arguments. What is Samādhi leading up to reality? It is that state where the two sorts of knowledge can no longer exists separate from each other. This is Samādhi leading up to reality. What are, O Exalted One, the two sorts of knowledge ? They are "literal" knowledge (*saṁvṛtisatya*) and "symbolic", "transcendental" knowledge" (*paramārthasatya*)".[1]

---

[1] Prajñopāyaviniścayasiddhi IV 7.

Here, in Samādhi, all barriers have been removed and the whole universe is stretched out before our eyes in lustre and splendour. Everything has become inmost and inalienable possession. Man has become what he has been from the very beginning. He has found peace of mind and coherence of action. In the realization of the undivided and indivisible whole all such artificial abstractions as man and woman, God and Universe, spiritual and material world have been abolished. No contradictions, no oppositions can ever again disturb this peace. It is not possible either that man relapses into a material or spiritual world.

"Therefore it has been said (in the Kālacakratantra) : "detached from the material and the immaterial". (The Sahaja ) cannot be conceived as material, because it is lacking in the accumulation of atoms which produces the (phenomenon of) dense matter and because it is (like) an army seen in a mirror; but it cannot be conceived as immaterial either(and, therefore, as unperceivable), because it is not beyond perception (i. e., the universe is perceived by the individual, but this perception does not affect him in any way and does not induce him to make artificial abstractions). For this reason, the universe (*bimba*) does not turn into material being, into the bustle of the world, and so also the Immutable (*akṣara*) does not turn into annihilation, into Nirvāṇa. Both aspects embrace each other. (The Sahaja) is tranquil, it does not change, because it is not subject to changes as are the senses (*indriyavikārarahitatvāt*). Consisting of two aspects (i. e., of masculinity and of femininity), it has an androgynous shape. It is without the one-sidedness of exclusive wisdom (*prajñā*, which, if it cannot express itself in activity, remains a sterile abstraction) and it is without ( the one-sidedness of) exclusive activity (*upāya*, which, if it is not supported by wisdom, remains incoherent fussiness). It is the unsurpassable, the sublime, because it is unique.

---

[1] Sekoddeśaṭīkā, pp. 70 sq.

"(Since it is extremely difficult to break through the premises of reasoning—they have been too awe-inspiring—someone might object): Since the Sahaja has evolved out of the Great Mudrā, it has been proven that the Sahaja has originated out of a cause and that the Great Mudrā is the cause. Since (the opposites of) cause and effect have not been transcended, both the Karmamudrā and the Jñānamudrā must be looked upon as causes of the Great Mudrā. What difference should exist (between these two as causes of the Great Mudrā and the Great Mudrā as cause of the Sahaja) ?

"(The refutation of this objection is that) wisdom (*prajñā*), represented as the universe (*bimba*) (and figuratively spoken of as cause) is the Void (i. e., the fact that as regards all phenomena we can only say "void"), that is to say, the knowledge that all manifestations and forms (are the Void by nature). This (wisdom) has not been created, because by nature it is not subject to any conditions (i. e., it is self-authentic). The effect which has sprung from wisdom as cause and which is called "having sprung from wisdom", has, as a matter of fact, not sprung from a cause (as this term is understood in intellection). That is to say, (the effect) has not sprung from wisdom as cause. Why is that so ? Because wisdom itself has not sprung from a cause. (Under these circumstances,) how can the effect which is called the Sahaja have sprung from a cause? After all, how is it possible to speak of causation, when (the sphere of the opposites, the circle of cause and effect) has been transcended!

"For this reason, Immutable knowledge (*akṣaraṁ jñānaṁ*) is knowledge in the realm of wisdom (*prajñājñānaṁ*), and this has not sprung from a cause. Since cause and effect do not obtain, it is not possible to maintain the proposition that the cause is determined by the effect and the effect by the cause. Why is it not possible to maintain the proposition that the cause is determined by the effect and the effect by the cause? The reason is that cause and effect are of relative validity only and (mutually conditioning) concepts, dependent on various conditions. But here we have to deal with what is beyond the relativity of ordinary ego-consciousness and is without beginning and end. Therefore, the universe of which it has been said that in it cause and effect are mutually determining and that it is the union of opposites (*yuganaddha*) where cause and effect are not different from each other, has not been created and does not pass away. It is exempt from origination and termination. It has also been stated that "whether or not Tathāgatas appear in this world, such is the nature of all things". Since that part, called wisdom (*prajñābhāga*), of the universe which is not different from both aspects (i. e., from wisdom and activity, since either of them is but an abstraction), has been tranquillity from the very beginning, it has not come into existence at all (*nityānutpanna*). Since that other part, called activity (*upāyabhāga*), can only be experienced within ourselves it is constantly rising (and waxing like the moon, (*sadodita*). For this reason, there is neither cause nor effect nor mutual determination".[1]

A few words are necessary to make these statements more intelligible. The very fact that the Sahaja can only be experienced within ourselves involves the problem of authentication. The notions of authentic and authentication are used constantly by all who recognize ways of knowing and ways of verifying other than those contemplated by the so-called empirical criterion. We say that something has the "authentic note". This means that we feel the sincerity of him who has made an assertion. It also means that somehow the "truth" of something has been conveyed to us. However, the authentic character of something is not determined by the verifiability of its assertion in the sense of the empirical criterion exclusively. That which makes something authentic is the fact that it shows forth certain qualities and values which are immediately recognized as authentic and acknowledged by the observer. In order to call something sublime, we must apprehend the quality sublime, and that can be done only by an emotional intuition which is totally different from sensuous observation. But this does not mean that authentication falls outside the realm of experience. It only shows the difference between verification by authentication and verification by the empirical criterion as understood in the narrow sense. When a value is shown forth and acknowledged, this is no less a matter of experience than when a sense datum is pointed out and that pointing is understood. The limitation of experience to the sensuously observable is but a part of the basically false initial assumption of the prior rights of the physical. Indeed, the Sahaja is no sensuously observable entity and its nature cannot be determined by any crucial experiment. But while it cannot be verified directly it is indirectly verifiable in the sense that it makes our experience as a whole intelligible. And, strange to say, this indirect verification is the most direct approach to reality. When nothing veils our eyes, when all fetters have been thrown off, reality has been found. But to say 'this is reality' is absolutely wrong. It cannot be limited to and by any of the specific definitions of limited universes of discourse. The whole is bliss–bliss, ineffable bliss!

---

[1] Sekoddeśaṭikā, p. 71.

"Oh friend, the lotus flower is full-blown, awakened by the Vajra :

In dance and in Great Bliss we jubilantly sing tooral lal looral lal la ;

Awakened by a ray of sunshine the lotus flower has begun to blossom in Great Bliss ;

In dance and in Great Bliss we jubilantly sing tooral lal looral lal la !" [1])

———

## 9. The Apparent Duality of the Cosmos and the Buddhahood of Man.

All manifestations in this world are characterized by a dual aspect. We may speak of positive and negative electricity, of potential and kinetic energy, or, in the realm of man, of masculinity and femininity, but the one is always the co-implicate of the other. The actual condition of every thing that we encounter is determined by

---

[1] Sādhanamālā II 460. Quotation from the Vajragītikā :

*hale sahi viasia kamalu pabohiu vajjē*
*alalalalaho mahāsuheṇa ārohiu ṇaccē*
*ravikiraṇeṇa paphulliu kamalu mahāsuheṇa*
*alalalalaho mahāsuheṇa ārohiu ṇaccē*

these two co-existent or concurrent activities. Now, the whole march of modern science has been toward the unification of concepts, the reduction of all matter to elements and then to a few types of particles, the reduction of "forces" to the single concept "energy", and finally the reduction of matter and energy to a singleb asic quantity. Prior to these achievements scientists had pictured the universe as a vessel containing two distinct elements, matter and energy. Matter was conceived as inert, tangible, and characterized by a property called mass, and energy was conceived as active, invisible, and without mass. Einstein showed that mass and energy are equivalent. The property called mass is concentrated energy, that is, matter is energy and energy is matter, and the distinction is simply one of temporary state. Thus, the baffling interplay of matter and radiation which appears sometimes to be a concourse of particles and sometimes a meeting of waves, has become more intelligible. The dual role of the electron as a unit of matter and a unit of electricity, simply describes different manifestations of one and the same reality. Matter and energy are interchangeable. If matter sheds its mass and travels with the speed of light we speak of radiation or energy, and if energy congeals and becomes inert and we can ascertain its mass we speak of matter. But the unknown yet remains. For we have only touched the physical aspect, while the mental has still to be ascertained.

Passing from physics, let us take man. Man is the focus of mighty activities which can be observed from within and from without. Man seen from within shows his thoughts, tendencies, desires, joys, and sorrows. Seen from without, man appears as the human body, his own and that of his fellow creatures. For this reason, man had once been looked upon as being made up of two distinct parts. However, we know that man is not fully comprised in his individual space-time continuum ; he extends far beyond it. We do not know his limits, and those we have set up are purely artificial. Since man does not allow himself to be observed simultaneously in his outer and inner aspects, we have been forced to divide him into different parts so that we are enabled to describe him. We may safely state that in the same way as body and soul, being the creations of our own methods of observation, cannot be separated from each other, as man cannot be separated from his environment, so also masculinity and femininity cannot be treated as distinct elements. All these aspects, carved from an indivisible whole, are man himself and must blend in his oneness.

The science of man is as old as mankind, but it is the least developed science, especially in the Western world. Man is a point in the universe, that is to say, he himself is the universe, though not in the sense of a rigid equation. The parts we have construed do not correspond to parts of the universe; on the contrary, the whole universe has condensed in him, as it were. In order to determine what this point "man" really is we have acted like a mathematician who, in order to locate a point, has set up a system of coordinates. For him any point in the plane of the two axis is completely located if its distance above or below the *X*-axis and its distance to the right or left of the *Y*-axis are known. But, fascinated by this game of locating points we have forgotten the point and taken the abscissa and the ordinate for "real". So we have turned very bad mathematicians, for a good mathematician never forgets that the *X*-axis and the *Y*-axis are abstractions created by him in order to solve a problem more easily. Indeed, it will be a tremendously hard task to turn one's eyes again toward the "point" and to treat the abstractions as what they are—abstractions, but not facts. The inertia of our thinking and reasoning ( *avidyā* ) is for ever at work to distract us from our goal and the fetish-character of words will continue to cast semantic fetters on us. Therefore, we must give up all theorization, although a theory is the best pretext for not being compelled to care for what the issue will be, and the best means to increase the vaingloriousness of our ego. Unlike Western philosophers the Buddhist sages had no taste for dialectical quibbles. They knew too well that every sort of argumentation leads away from the life of the spirit into the desert of conceptual abstractions. An individual ridden by concepts instead of being aware of the realities of life will be inextricably involved in meshes of contradictions and altercations. Therefore the Buddhist sages did not hesitate to deride their own texts, because what is important to them is not the dogmatic system but the ultimate goal. Thus, for instance, Saraha states that

> "Someone busies himself with ( the teachings of ) Mahāyāna, though they are but holy scripture and logical treatises. Some other one meditates on the maṇḍala, and still another one busies himself with some other thing.
>
> "Someone tries to reason out the element ether; someone else makes it consist of emptiness. After all, they busy themselves with contradictory propositions."[1]

---

[1] **Saraha 11-12 :**

*kha-cig theg-chen de-la rgyug byed ciṅ*
*de ni gzuṅ-lugs tshad-mai bstan-bcos yin*
*gzan yaṅ dkyil-ḥkhor ḥkhor-lo ma-lus bsgom*
*kha-cig bzi-bai don ḥchad-pa-la zugs*

> "Neither the mantras nor the Tantras nor the subjects of meditation nor concentration ( alone are responsible for man's delusions ) they all are the causes of delusion, you fool! The mind is pure, do not stain it by meditation! If you are happy do not spoil your happiness."[1]
>
> "My son, understand that the belief in the drink of immortality is profound ignorance. Reading the explanations people have not understood the meaning af purification."[2]
>
> "A scholar explains all didactic writings. Yet he does not know that the Buddha lives in him. He has not mastered the systolic and diastolic movements ( of his life forces ). And yet this impertinent fellow exclaims "I am a sage!"[3]

To the puerile Western mind such statements seem to be highly blasphemous. The Westerner's master delusion of rightness has made him abandon every thought except

---

*la-la nam-mkhai khams-la rtog-par snaṅ*
*gzan yaṅ ñid-ldan-par byed-pade*
*phal-cher mi mthun phyogs-la zugs-pa yin*

[1] Saraha 25 :
*manta ṇa tanta ṇa dhea ṇa dkāraṇa*
*sabba bi re baḍha bibbhama-kāraṇa*
*asamala citta ma jhāṇahi kharaḍaha*
*suha acchanta ma appaṇu jagaḍaha*

[2] Saraha 53 :
*are putta bojjhu rasa-rasaṇa susaṁṭhia abejjā*
*bakkhāṇa paḍhantehi jagahi ṇa jāṇiaü sojjha*

[3] Saraha 70 :
*paṇḍia saala sattha bakkhāṇai*
*dehahi Buddha basanta ṇa jāṇai*
*amaṇāgamaṇa ṇa tena bikhaṇḍia*
*ṭobi ṇilajja bhaṇai haü paṇḍia*

cracking skulls. His passions generated by value appreciations have crystallized into ideologies of hate. He is always disturbed when others take different paths and are not taken in by any kind by systematic belief. Disagreement is a heinous crime. Hence the frequency in Western history with which in medieval time heretics got burned and in modern time deviationists get purged. Nothing has purged him of this theological attitude toward truth and heresy. It must always be witch-hunting and unconditional surrender to "words, words, mere words, no matter from the heart."[1] It seems that Mephistopheles in Goethe's Faust has pronounced a truth absolutely binding to the Western world :

> On words let your attention centre !
> Then through the safest gate you'll enter
> The temple halls of Certainty.
> With words 'tis excellent disputing;
> Systems to words 'tis easy suiting;
> On words 'tis excellent believing;
> No word can ever lose a jot from thieving.[2]

This contrast in Indian and Western attitudes toward the problem of man makes it extremely difficult to understand the feeling of being the universe which lends to the individual self, the dignity and importance which derives from belonging to something greater than self. And yet this feeling is the most important thing, because it makes one's slightest experiences, one's smallest acts, seem extremely significant, while at the same time preventing the greatest ones from seeming excessively significant. All roads trace back to man, though they sometimes seem to lead away from him. Man is made on the scale of the terrestrial mountains, valleys, oceans, and rivers. He belongs to the surface of the earth, exactly as plants and animals do. But he also belongs to another world. The time has come for man to find his proper place, Saraha was aware of this fact when he once asked

---

[1] William Shakespeare, Troilus and Cressida, Act v, scene iii.

[2] Goethe, Fust, part i. English translation by Bayard Taylor. The German version runs as follows :

> Im ganzen-haltet Euch an Worte !
> Dann geht Ihr durch die sichre Pforte
> Zum Temple der Gewissheit ein.
>
> ……
>
> Mit Worten last sich trefflich streiten,
> Mit Worten ein System bereiten
> An Worte läst sich trefflich glauben;
> Von eineffi Wort lässt sich kein Iota rauben.

> "How can one dive into the intricate mystery of man when one does not see where one is located."[1]

The apparent dual aspect of man as well as of the whole universe, of which the human is but a certain manifestation, has been symbolized by the Prajñopāya. Prajñā is the female aspect and Upāya is the male aspect. When they are represented or "pictured" in anthropomorphic shape they embrace each other, touching at all points of contact. This is to show that the one cannot be without the other and that they are basically one. Now, this symbol is of special significance. It comprises the physical symbol by means of which man's spiritual journey is pictured and the cosmic symbol by means of which spiritual things and relations are suggested. It is the means of apprehending and expressing value relations not otherwise expressible, and their expansion shows this to be so. Thus, the essential function of this symbol is to give us insight

---

[1] Saraha 69 :

*aisē bisama sāndhi ko paisai*
*jo jahi atthi jāba ṇaü dīsai*

into and knowledge of Reality. We may call this "perspected" in contrast to "asserted" reality. However, if we try to expand and to interpret this symbol we may destroy its symbol character. Therefore, any interpretation of its unexpressed reference must be connected with a deepening of the meaning, which involves the elements of feeling and emotion. Interpreted, this symbol means that the Dhātus or elementary phenomena must combine with the Skandhas or forces, which together produce what is called man or the universe. The Dhātus are female and comprise five items which are arranged according to density : density of matter ( including elasticity of form and volume ( *pṛthivī* ), cohesion ( *ab* ), heat ( *tejas* ), expansion ( *vāyu* ), and space ( *ākāśa* ). To these five female items correspond five male items, also arranged according to decreasing density : materiality ( muscles, sinews, bones, etc., ( *rūpa* ), feeling ( *vedanā* ) sensation (*saṁjñā*), motivity (*saṁskārāḥ*), and consciousness (*vijnāna*). This polarity may be spoken of as potential and kinetic energy, the Prajñā or the Dhātus being the potential energy and the Upāya and the Skandhas being the kinetic energy. Their concourse produces a given phenomenon. By interpreting the symbol in this way, however, we must not overlook the danger of mechanistic utterance which tends to create myth by understatement. For our mechanistic utterance may lead to the concept that the bidynamics of life consists in a positive system of processes and a negative after-effect or form of intra—and intermolecular collapse, releasing energy like a falling body, or that it may be compared to gas engine combustion. But such concepts are utterly inadequate. The energic reserves ( Dhātus ) are not "burned as fuels", but, as indicated by the best evidence on radioactive isotopes in metabolism, are worked over into living structures before they are broken down for energy release in work. However, whatever the case may be, to dissolve the symbol into physics or something else is to denature it. The important thing is to retain the nuances of meaning and the feeling-emotional tone of that which is interpreted and translated.

The fact that the elementary phenomena, the "reserves" ( *dhātu* ), are thought to be female and conceived as "wisdom" ( *prajñā* ), while the forces ( *skandha* ) that operate conjointly with them are thought to be male and conceived as "activity" (*upāya*), is ample proof of the deep insight into and understanding of the wholeness of life the Buddhist Tāntrics have had. Femininity which is experienced by the male through the objective woman and through the unconscious forces of his psyche, is more deeply rooted in the realm of possibilities than are the male forces which, though they operate conjointly with the female forces, more often combat them and are in danger to lose the contact with the deeper layers of life. It is true, as long as wholeness has not been realized it is impossible to make any assertions as regard what masculinity and femininity are in reality. We can only speak about that which appears as a man's or a woman's consciousness. And this is rather limited, because it is confined to the surface, to our ego, linked up with the physical sex. It is equally true that man's consciousness has conquered vast regions of the outer world at the expense, however, of having lost the access to and the contact with the unconscious possibilities, while, on the other hand, a woman's consciousness has conquered relatively little of the outside world as it is seen by the male. However, it would be erroneous to call a woman's consciousness an inferior sort of consciousness. A woman's consciousness is only different from that of the male. Any evaluation is out of place. By a woman many things are already seen, while the man still pokes about in the dark. A woman is aware of the attendant circumstances and of the possibilities connected with them which, as a rule, a man is unable to see. For this reason, the world of the woman appears to the male as getting lost in ages and cosmic infinitude. But, as a matter of fact, it is this expansion into the infinite, ageless, and transcendental which can give most valuable hints and impulses. Because of this transcendental character it is aptly called wisdom. And wisdom is more than intellectual knowledge.

> "One speaks of wisdom, because it goes beyond a conceptually differentiated reality".[1]

The woman and all that is connected with her is to the male a strange and yet most intimate world, waiting to be realized. We may rightly ask how it might have occurred to man to divide the universe into a world of possibilities and a world of facts, into masculinity and femininity, if he had not had the original in him : the unlimited world of possibilities, the fantastic play of the images of the world outside consciousness, and the narrow world of facts, the images of consciousness. But both these aspects, consciousness and the unconscious, are one. They only appear as two distinct elements according as the one or the other is placed foremost and thus comes into the focus of discriminating reason.

> "Non-dual are all phenomena; they only appear in dual shape ( to man's discriminating reason )".[2]

---

[1] Prajñopāyaviniścayasiddhi IV 10.

[2] Guhyasamājatantra, p. 161 :
*advayāḥ sarvadharmās tu dvayabhāvena lakṣitāḥ*

Although we speak of the polarity of man and of the universe I want to make clear one point which, if overlooked, might give rise to serious misunderstandings. The equation of femininity with "wisdom" and of masculinity with "activity" is not at all an idealization of the existing duality of man and woman. Idealizations occur when one attempts to deceive oneself about an annoying fact. They are preventive measures dictated by a secret fear of reality. But here we have to do with what is to be achieved and must be the fulfilment of man. How absurd it is to see an idealization in "wisdam" and "activity" is borne out by the statement that in its highest form the male aspect (*upāya*) is all-comprehensive kindness (*karuṇā*), while the female aspect (*prajñā*) is the Void, that is, the fact that, when the egotistic attitude has been broken through, there is no longer a something which the "I" must punish, reform, or wipe out (*śūnyatā*). If we consider the ordinary duality of man and woman such an assertion is absolutely nonsensical. To our common sense it is the woman who embodies all kindness and love, while the man is the model of spiritual qualities. But neither the kindness of the woman nor the reason of the man will lead to the goal, on the contrary, they are the strongest fetters and obstacles. The kindness of the woman is ego-related, it is shown to the small world of husband, children, and nearest relatives. In the same way the reason of the man is ego-related and concerned with thirst for fame and similar egotistic vanities. By clinging to such superficialities the gap between the individual and wholeness becomes almost unbridgeable. Therefore, through integrating femininity, that is, all that has been excluded from the world of the ego, the man must convert his "reasonable" activity into kindness which comprises the whole universe. In exactly the same way, through integrating masculinity, the woman must develop the faculty of insight into what lies beyond her family cycle. In no way must this development degenerate into mere intellection. If this integration and change of personality are achieved the artificial distinction of man and woman will vanish. The most detrimental thing would be if the man simply imitated the apparent kindness of the woman or if the woman copied the intellectual activity of the man. He would become an effeminate simpleton and she a disputatious hag. Neither could stand the other. Where vital issues are at stake cheap imitations are impossible. Wholeness asks for the whole in man.

"When one realizes that all phenomena are not a something (*niḥsvabhāvatā = śūnyatā*) and when one differentiates between knowledge and the knowledgeable one speaks of the essence of wisdom (*prajñātattva*)

"Since it affects (*rañjati*) all beings distressed by the floods of suffering, rising from various causes, kindness (*kṛpā*) is sung of as love (*rāga*).

"Since in a proper way, like a boat, it leads up to the desired goal (*upānayati*) one praises it as activity (*upāya*) because of its properness.

"Their unity, like that of water and milk, is called activity full of wisdom (*prajñopāya*) because of their non-duality."[1]

The male-female polarity, described by the symbols of the Dhātus and of the Skandhas and representing both man and the universe, is restricted to the realm of the physical. In the human sphere of man and woman this polarity corresponds to the relation of the man to the Karmamudrā, which culminates in the momentary satiation of the physiological sex drive. The physical co-implicates the mental. Both the physical and the mental are one in exactly the same way as man and universe are one. The polarity of matter and mind is seen in the fact that, viewed from a spiritual level, the "material" Dhātus are goddesses and that the "material" Skandhas are Buddhas. Again the basic polarity of masculinity and femininity is pointed out.

---

[1] Prajñopâyaviniścayasiddhi I 14-17.

> "In short, the five Skandhas are called the five Buddhas."[1]

Thus we read in the Guhyasamājatantra, and the venerable Indrabhūti states that

> "Because the five Skandhas are by nature Buddhas, they are called the Victorious Ones (*jina,* Buddha); the Dhātus are called Locanā and so on. For this reason, one speaks of the Buddha-nature (of all beings and of the whole universe).
>
> "Since all the beings in the three worlds are by nature always Buddhas, all their activities serve the end to realize Buddhahood. In vain is the occupation with tradition.
>
> "Since all the world is the Buddha, all the beings in the three worlds are the Bnddha, too. The trouble-some experiences of pleasure, sorrow, lust and so on are not meant for (such a) world."[2]

The five Buddhas are in the sequence of the five Skandhas; the white Vairocana, the yellow Ratnasambhava, the red Amitābha, the green Amoghasiddhi, and the dark blue or black Akṣobhya. The five corresponding female deities are: Locanā, Māmakī, Pāṇḍaravāsinī, Tāriṇī (or more frequently Tārā), and Vajradhātvīśvarī.

---

[1] Guhyasamâjatantra. p. 137.

[2] Jñânasiddhi II 1-3.

These divine figures, commonly known as the Dhyānibuddhas and their śaktis, are not at all something ultimate. They are but another aspect of the indivisible whole, the mental aspect, just as the Skandhas and the Dhātus are the "material" or physical aspect. Therefore, to give oneself up to this divine world is as stupid as to cling to the material world. Both worlds are not made for us, because they are born from the error of our reason and from the ignorance of our true nature. To such worlds we cannot become adapted. However, the fact that man in his physical aspect is just as admirable and divine as in his mental aspect) gives him a sense of his own dignity and liberates him from the degradation into which he has been driven by the Christian dualism and its contempt for the flesh. Indeed, although the West has attributed a greater reality and a privileged position to matter and, in course of time, even has discarded belief in soul—to the extent that one constantly quarrels about its meaning—it has retained the contemptuous attitude toward dust, the dust which is all of man that remains when soul has departed. Despising his unique desire to living, dreading the worm, and thinking of himself as worm-fodder (the Western man not only lowered his sense of his own dignity but also lost the respect of others. Hence the mortal madness of retaining some war-making potentialities and of embarking on a program of surprise attacks against others in order to postpone the ignominous end. Yet it may be asked, who is the more divine, he who neglects and spurns the body or mind that he may attain some fancied superiority, or he who cherishes both as the moulds in which reality expresses itself? He who realizes that his life and all its activities are not a thing apart, to be held and pursued egotistically, as if enjoyment was something to be filched from the whole with a sense of separateness, will more speedily and truly attain the goal than by neurotically fleeing from and casting aside some aspect or other as being either unspiritual or illusory. To neglect or to deny the needs of the body, to think of it as something not divine, is to neglect and to deny all life. Since, as I have said, man is a point in which the whole universe has condensed, as it were, even the allegedly lowliest physical needs take on a cosmic character, to say nothing of the mental activities which, after all, cannot be dealt with as something apart. It is not true that happiness can only be held by absence of enjoyment now or by deliberately sought-for suffering and mortification. But it is true that a life of mingled pleasure and pain is due to one-sidedness, when one aspect or another is unduly emphasized. He who strives for wholeness, who goes for the root from whence everything he has split up into contradictory propositions has started, will see that there cannot be separateness between him and the whole, and happiness and bliss are his.

> "Although he enjoys the objective world he is not taken in by the objects. One plucks the lotus flower without getting wet from the water. So also the Yogin who goes for the root (from whence everything has started), though enjoying the objective world, is not affected by the objects".[1]

---

[1] Saraha 66:

*bisaa ramanta ṇa bisaa bilippai*
*ūala harai ṇa pāṇī chippai*
*emai joi mūla saranto*
*bisahi na bāhai bisaa ramanto*

We do not apprehend man as a whole. We only know him as composed of distinct parts, and even these parts have been created by our methods. Each one of us is made up of a series of phantoms. And yet we are more than the sum of all the facts accumulated by the particular methods. We have construed such concepts as body and mind, universe and God, we have developed the most refined techniques, but the whole, reality, has evaded us. Indeed, we have perpetuated the error of Descartes, taking our abstractions for concrete facts. We have, furthermore, succeeded in depriving the world of gods, in return for which, matter has taken possession of us like an evil, all-devouring demon. We have not grown, but have become dejected materialists. Instead of experiencing values, more valuable than the common values, which would have been made accessible by the Jñānamudrā as far as the relationship between man and woman and between man and himself is concerned, we have not only remained on the level of the Karmamudrā, but have become degraded below the lowest level of human degradation. And yet the divine aspect is as real as the "material" and "matter of fact" aspect. For in the same way as the material-physical aspect of the whole, the Dhātus and Skandhas, may be compared to the physiological relationship of man and woman, the Karmamudrā, the mental and divine aspect, the Dhyānibuddhas and Śaktis, may be compared to the Jñānamudrā, now no longer restricted to the realm of man, creating in him self-respect and respect of others, but extending into and comprising the whole universe.

Actually, the world of the gods and goddesses is just as much a creation of our mind as the material world. None can be said to be something ultimate. If we want to attain the whole we must disentangle ourselves from all such abstractions and look behind the veil. If, however, we concretize that which crowds into our ego and because of its transcending the narrow world of our ego has a superhuman, divine character, that is, if we continue to take the manifestation for the principle, we will forever be bothered by such concepts as matter and mind, universe and God. God or the gods must be "perspected". It will never do to assert or to deny them. Such is only the procedure of the unfit, the mangled in spirit and the crippled in life.

> "Whatever becomes manifest has the shape of the deity. This is by nature not a something. Whatever the manifestation may be, it is always Śūnyatā by nature".[1]

Man's attention has been attracted by the outside world. The stimuli coming from his inner world do not, as a rule, pass the threshold of consciousness. However, they do give a certain colour to his thoughts, his emotions, his actions, although he does not clearly realize their hidden power. The inner world obscurely acts on consciousness. Sometimes this inner world may sound an alarm. And this depth consciousness, as I should like to call the hidden power of the inner world, is rarely mistaken. But, by being attracted by the outside world, man has become accustomed to concretize that which comes from the depths of his inner being and to project, to localize, it in an outside world, perhaps even somewhere in heaven. Thus he has become inextricably mixed up with the within and the without. Physiologically speaking, however, cortical, that is, detached rational thought, is a new and fragile acquisition which breaks down at the slightest irritation of the viscera, reported by the autonomous nervous system to the thalamus. Thalamic consciousness is characterized by emotions and feelings, cortical consciousness by formal reasoning. Modern man has lost the awareness of his dual consciousness and, although in twenty-three out of twenty-four hours he is dominated by thalamic consciousness, he believes that he only uses cortical consciousness. His ego has a natural aversion of candidly admitting that "anything" is capable of affecting man's most personal being. But, as a matter of fact, the freedom and intentionality of the ego is a master illusion.

---

[1] **Advayavajra, Mahâsukhaprakâśs:**
*sphūrtiś ca devatākārā niḥsvabhāvā svabhāvataḥ*
*yathā yathā bhavet sphūrtiḥ sā tathâ śūnyatâtmikâ*

Now, when we remember that the Skandhas and Dhātus have been arranged according to decreasing density and that "materiality" (*rūpa*) is placed foremost as having the maximum of density, we should assume that its colour must be the darkest one. Our intellect is inclined to compare the colour of the Skandhas and Dhātus, the Dhyānibuddhas and Śaktis, to the refraction of light through a glass prism. Applying this physical law we should expect that the clear and bright light of the Void (*śūnyatā*), according as it is refracted and deflected through the prism of our mind, must be totally absorbed by our body and that of our fellow creatures as having the maximum of density, so that its colour ought to be blue or indigo or violet. But we are told that it is white. This clearly shows that the colours of the deities are not derived from the observation of physical laws but stem from experiences and insight. The fact is that we only believe ourselves to be fully aware of the so-called outside world and that we fancy this belief to be knowledge. Materiality which we attribute to the outside world and the belief in it is not just another expression of man's unconscious mind, but it involves his unconscious mind. The roots of its emotional dynamism are there. Instead of admitting to ourselves that, because of this emotional dynamism, there are also irrational and contradictory elements in it, we invent ideologies and theories which rationalize our beliefs into neat and orderly systems that are capable of explaining anything, because they omit everything which their premises cannot explain. Such ideologies usually end by becoming systematic delusions, if they do not start already from delusions. For the basic fallacy of all our theories is the feeling that the abstractions we have construed should be "sound," that is, founded on truth. The Buddhists knew better. They were not ashamed of admitting that the convictions which the ordinary man calls knowledge are founded on emotion. Therefore, the light of our reason, our intellectual knowledge, which makes us turn our eyes toward the without and to which the outside world seems to be clear and bright, is not the bright light of the Void, which is all-comprehensive and not concerned with conceptual scaffolds, but the dim light of infatuation, the delusive light of the illusions we create in our minds about the nature of things which, since they have been illuminated by this light, we have not understood at all. For this reason, what we call materiality and as it is seen by our mortal eyes is bound up with delusion (*moha*).[1]

Conversely, we should assume that our consciousness, our mental activity (*vijñāna*), should absorb very little light because of its rather insignificant density and that it should be bright. The Indian term (*vijñāna*) signifies more than our term "consciousness"; it also comprises that which has been before consciousness, that is, before ego-consciousness has developed. Thus transcending the pettishness of the ego it is closely related to, if not the same with the Void (*śūnyatā*). The Void means that there is not a something, only ego-consciousness is a something and has to do with a something. But that which lies beyond the realm of ego-consciousness can never be said to be a something. As has already been pointed out, everything that exists starts from the Void, that is, everything we encounter in this world, be it the material or the mental world, is a mould in which the Void expresses itself. Therefore, as soon as something develops there is at the beginning a flash of the Void or the whole (*śūnyatābodhi*), and that which develops seems to become something apart from the whole. Since, moreover, rebirth may be spoken of prosaically as a transformation of energy, at the moment where one transformation has come to an end and a new gets on its way, we again have the Void or the whole which later on is seen partially in the Skandhas and the Dhātus. For this reason, Nāropa states that "when the beings die, that is, when the (present) Skandhas break and are discarded and new Skandhas are taken on (i.e., the breaking and taking-on has to be understood figuratively, because the new is a transformation of the old, and transformation means that neither absolute identity nor absolute diversity obtain), that which is between (these two moments) is the Void (*śūnyatā*) and there is a unique view of the three worlds. This view itself is the Void. There is no doubt about that".[1] Owing to its relatedness to and its being basically one with the Void our mind should be bright and clear and transparent. But it is dark blue or black. Our mind is like an object standing before a source of light. As is well known, if an object, standing in front of a light, is not transparent—our mind cannot be transparent, because it is obscured by ego-ness and like a wall separates us from the whole—it appears the darker, the brighter the light that stands behind it, shines. Because our ego-bound mind is only aware of the narrow world it has created for itself and because it can never be the whole, it is, indeed, the blackest object, acting like the shutter of a camera.

---

[1] In his Pañcâkâra, Advayavajra tells us that Locanâ is connected with delusion (*moha*), Mâmakī with hatred (*dveṣa*). Pâṇḍaravâsinī with lust (*râga*), and Tāra with jealousy (*īrṣyâ*).

---

[1] Sekoddeśaṭīkâ, p. 43.

The fact that the parts, into which we have arbitrarily split up man and the universe, contain the element of bi-polarity and that they may be looked upon as either having literal significance or as having symbolic significance, makes it clear that one function of them is to evoke emotions and value appreciations and that they also embody a meaning and a reality which transcends the body as well as its activities and in a sense lies beyond them, although it is fused with them. Therefore, the divine aspect, the Dhyānibuddhas and the śaktis, are certainly relevatory. The point I want to make is that in so far as emotional attitudes are evoked in us, there has been revealed to us something of the inner spirit of man and the universe which may be taken as part of our understanding of the world. That which has been revealed to us as giving and furthering insight into the nature of man is described in the following verses, accounting for the names of the Dhyānibuddhas and śaktis:

> "The pure Buddha-knowledge is called *Vairocana* (The resplendent One).
>
> "Because this knowledge can never be shaken by uneducated people and also not by professors (*mithyāgurujanair api*), it is called *Akṣobhya* (The One who cannot be shaken),

"Because there is no doubt about the fact that the jewels like the Buddha and so on rise (out of this knowledge) and because this knowledge is concerned with the needs of the beings, it is called *Ratnasambhava* (Origin of Jewels).

"(This knowledge) is truly liberation because in it there is nothing against which a hostile attitude may be taken up (*apratiṣṭhitanirvāṇa*), it is not contaminated by (such concepts as) being and non-being, and because it is linked up with infinite merits, it is called *Amitābha* (Infinite Splendour).

"Because this Great Knowledge is most effective in accomplishing all that has to be done by the beings, because its accomplishments are never frustrated, it is called *Amoghasiddhi* (Whose accomplishments are not frustrated).

"Because matter, fine and gross, spreading through the three aspects of time, is seen wherever it is located, (this knowledge) is called *Locanā* (She who sees).

"Because the All-Buddha-knowledge is the same to itself as well as to me and because (these "two" aspects) are mutually penetrating, it is called *Māmakī* (Mine-ness).

"Because the sublime All-Buddha-knowledge wipes out all blemishes and because it is ever ready to purify all and everything, it is called *Pāṇḍaravāsinī* (She who abides in whiteness).

"Because this knowledge is ever intent upon saving the world by means of Great Compassion and because it is so much suited to carry the beings to the other bank (of the river of existence), it is called *Tārā* (She who redeems)".[1]

---

[1] Jñānasiddhi XV. 12-20.

This knowledge is, to be sure, symbolic knowledge, that is, for a "literal" copy is substituted a variant which precisely by its variation, suggests or symbolizes something other than itself. In the case under consideration the immediately given intuition is moulded in the very process of intuition in such a way as to make the intuition a symbol for the nonintuited. Now it is of utmost importance that also the Dhyānibuddhas and Śaktis are symbols and not ultimates. As to the relation between the Skandhas and Dhātus, on the one hand, and the Dhyānibuddhas and Śaktis, on the other, we have seen that the attitude of symbolism consists in endowing an occurrence in space and time with a meaning to which greater value or significance is given than belong to it in its pure actuality. That is to say, images or ideas are taken from narrower and more intuitible relations and used as expressions for more ideal relations which cannot be either directly or better expressed. The underlying notion is that the phenomenal world is an expression of a noumenal or intelligible world and that, because of this relation, the phenomenal may be taken to represent or stand as a symbol for the noumenal. This has been the Platonic theory of symbolism. The basic fallacy is that it unreasonably takes one aspect, the phenomenal, for symbolic and the other, the intelligible world, for ultimate. It overlooks the fact that both the phenomenal and the non-phenomenal are abstractions created by our minds. This duality-complex of the Westerners, imprisoning their thoughts between the forbidding walls of matter and mind and making them wrestling about the particular and the universal, has constantly been a gloom-spot in Western philosophies and sciences, which branched off in course of time. Even modern depth psychology, postulating archetypes (*vāsanā*), has not been able to get rid of this dualism. The tragic reality is that this intellectual discipline which, more than any other, should have led to a fundamental re-education and perfectionment of man has so far contributed very little to the development and growth of man. And not only that, almost all our psychological concepts reflect the basic medical concept of disease and the philosophical premises of the Greeks, which subtly falsify them when they are applied to the problem of man, where they are needed as badly as in medicine. Thus, the whole modern concept of neurosis, which should have been so fruitful, has done even less to solve the problem of man than the earlier concepts of error and sin, because the psychologists and their ancestors, the psychiatrists, who invented it were led by their medical and philosophical training as well as by the nature of the case histories to consider man and his problems as an abnormality. The result is that the men who should be the best equipped to understand the darkness of the world are completely unable to make those who control the destinies of the world understand what darkness is. The Buddhist minds, on the other hand, which were concerned with the whole and refused to set up standardized patterns, have throughout the ages wandered freely over the same speculative field without bitterness or despair. To them the divine and the non-divine have never been mutually exclusive. One has been as thrilling and awe-inspiring as the other.

It need scarcely be reiterated that every dualistic view with its implicit mechanisticism, so clearly seen in the futile quarrel of the vitalists and the mechanists, leads ever more deeply into paradoxes, and all *ad hoc* hypotheses invented to solve the difficulties only serve to lead more deeply into the morass. It is evident that all such systems should be rejected, because they violate reality. One must be content with having operational concepts of such an experience as the Skandhas and Dhātus as well as the Dhyānibuddhas and Śaktis. None of these con-concepts can be reduced to or dissolved into the other. The question of truth and error, the latter being auto-suggestion or hallucination in modern terminology, does not enter. Of course, the silliness of all that is not matter is not true, is hard to disprove to a literal mind or to a modern logician. By realizing, however, that "blunt" truth, this authoritative postulate of Western reasoning, is pure abstraction and that for the Western philosophy of nothingbutism this blunt truth is either physics, chemistry and mechanics as far as the universe and man is concerned, or mind and God, we attain that state where we are not any longer torn by contradictory assertions. In other words, when we recognize the fact that the Karmamudrā or the Skandhas and Dhātus as well as the Jñānamudrā or the Dhyānibuddhas and Śaktis are but two manifestations of the whole, we become liberated from our one-sidedness. The abstractions we have created lose their hold over us, because they have been "perspected". This state is, as has already been said, the Mahāmudrā or the Dharmakāya. However, if we want to communicate this state and experience to others we cannot do otherwise but resort to symbolic knowledge which has a dual character. That is to say, it contains an element of representation, the Dhyānibuddhas and the Śaktis, but it also symbolizes something other than itself. Needless to say that this dual character involves all other dualities. This symbolic knowledge which I have pointed to in connection with the Śaktis is described as regards the male aspect-masculinity and femininity are never completely separable—in the following words :

"It is called wholly auspicious (*samantabhadrā*) ; it is known as the Mahāmudrā ; it is the Dharmakāya and mirror-like wisdom (*ādarśajñāna*).

"In the same way as the reflection of one's own (face) is surely seen in a mirror, so also the Dharmakāya is seen in the mirror of wisdom.

"It is called equal-intension wisdom (*samatājñāna*), because it has been realized that this All-Buddha-knowledge is the same as to oneself and others.

"It is called distinguishing wisdom (*pratyavekṣaṇa-jñāna*), because it is pure from the very beginning, not created, radiant by itself, and mutually penetrating.

"It is called all-accomplishing wisdom (*kṛtyānuṣṭhāna-jñāna*) because at all places and at all times it accomplishes the work to be done by the Buddhas and because to do such works is incumbent on all Buddhas.

"It is called purified wisdom (*suviśuddhajñāna*), because by it the indefatigable and excellent Yogins become free from the (fetters of) the passions (which obstruct the way toward enlightenment) and the conceptual scaffolds (which veil the insight into the true nature of man) (*kleśajñeyāvṛtam*)."[1]

Now, it will have been observed that five Dhyānibuddhas have been discussed, but only four Śaktis. The fifth Śakti, Vajradhātvīśvarī, has not been mentioned at all. This remarkable fact is most revelatory of the insight the Buddhist sages have had into the nature of man. It is man's ego-consciousness which has become separated from the whole. Therefore, consciousness, which in the ordinary sense of the word is formal reasoning and moving in logical dichotomies, cannot be in union with a Śakti. For to be in union with the female element, if one is a male, means that the one-sidedness and separateness has vanished and that the whole has been realized. But, it is an undeniable fact that all activities of man, the physiological and psychological ones, excepted consciousness, are linked up with the whole, though in an invisible and still unknown way. The male-female correlation may be fundamentally simple, but somehow we miss its oneness. We give to things an artificial individuality. We actually do not know where the frontiers of the organs and the body are located. Neither do we understand the correlation between different individuals, for instance, the corresponding existence of the penis and the vagina, nor do we understand the cooperation of two individuals in the same physiological process, such as the fecundation of the egg by the spermatozoon. Our concepts of individuality, organization, space and time do not help us to understand these phenomena. But when the ego is transcended or merges into a wider and deeper realm, when the artificial dualism of ego and non-ego has become meaningless, as it were, because the one undivided and indivisible whole has been realized, then-male-female oneness is no longer a problem. Indeed, in the same way as our organs and our body are not what they seem to be, so also consciousness is not what we believe it to be; it is mere than the artefact called consciousness or mind, consciousness and the unconscious together. The whole is Vajrasattva and Vajradhātvīśvarī. And they are, like the Dhyānibuddhas and the Śaktis, not two but one. Thus, Advayavajra states that

---

[1] Jñānasiddhi I, 48-53.

"These four (Śaktis : Locanā, Māmakī, Pāṇḍaravāsinī, Tārā) are like girls of about sixteen years, endowed with unparalleled beauty and splendour of youth, staying in radiancy, partaking of the nature of the four *kāyas* like the (Dhyānibuddhas), gladdening the heart, being the foundation of the excellencies of all the Buddhas, and by nature the five Tathāgatas. In their midst stays the Vajradhātvīśvarī, whose nature are the vowels, the leader, by nature the same as Vajrasattva. She is called the Exalted One, Suchness, the Void, Wisdom-completion, the end of the world, the Fact-that-there-is-not-a-something.[1]

Modern physics has shown that mass and energy are equivalent: the property called mass is simply concentrated energy, and, what is more, matter and energy are interchangeable. It is obvious, therefore, that we can say that "mass" is marked by "energy," at least, when we want to communicate it to others. Within certain limits the concepts of modern physics assist us in understanding why it has been stated that the "masses" of the four Skandhas materiality (*rūpa*), feeling (*vedanā*) sensation (*saṁjñā*), and motivity (*saṁskārāh*) are marked by consciousness (*vijñāna*). As has been said, the Indian term *vijñāna* denotes more than consciousness in our sense of the word and, for this reason, we may, for the time being, render it in modern terminology by "energy." However, we have to bear in mind that in Buddhism the concept of energy is not merely quantitative but essentially qualitative. Thus, of this relationship between "mass" and "energy" Advayavajra states as follows:

The five Skandhas are the five Tathāgatas. Now the questions is: have the first four been marked by Akṣobhya (consciousness, energy), in order to make it clear (to us) that they are congealed energy? The answer is: energy (*vijñāna*) is the single basic quantity-quality;

---

[1] Advayavajra, Pañcâkâra, p. 43.

it is symbolically known, free from (such conceptual scaffolds as) subject and object, because the relationship between a subject and an outside world is (essentially) the Void (*śūnyatā*). This (basic energy) which may be compared to the clear sky at noon in autumn, is conceived by (the adherents of the Yogācāra-school), who speak of attributelessness as the primary. Therefore, it has been stated that

> The Void which (owing to the power of ignorance) is conceived as an object is without any delusive appearance and without any distinct form. As thus existing it is experienced. It is only veiled by secondary appearances (which our ignorance takes for ultimates).

It has also been said that

> The two forms of manifestation (i.e. the Sambhogakāya and the Nirmāṇakāya) are secondary.

Furthermore,

> Inexpressible by concepts and words, without any delusive appearance—this is the Dharmakāya of the Great Sage. The two other forms of manifestation which have derived from it are the secondary and the trickeries (*māyā*) of intellection.

Now, if it has been proved by the mark of Akṣobhya (that the physiological and psychological aspects of our being are congealed energy), why then is Akṣobhya marked by Vajrasattva? For thus we have already been taught by tradition. The answer that this is so in order to show that the Void appears to us in an imagined form cannot hold good. For this has already been proved by the mark of Akṣobhya. The correct answer is that, in the same way as by the mark of Akṣobhya, it has been proved that consciousness (*jñānavijñāna*) is the primary and everything else the secondary, so also by the mark of Vajrasattva is to be understood that consciousness ( energy, *vijñāna*) is the secondary and that the primary is the Vajra ( the Indestructible ). In the Vajraśekhara it has been said that

> The Void ( *śūnyatā* ) is called Vajra, because it is firm, sound, cannot be changed, cannot be pierced, cannot be split, cannot be burned, cannot be destroyed".[1]

Elsewhere Advayavajra declares that

"In order to show that Vairocana, Ratnasambhava, Amitābha, and Amoghasiddhi, who are sitting in the Vajra-posture ; who have two arms and one face ; whose heads are bald but for a tuft of hair and who are dressed in a yellowish red garment ; who are adorned with the thirty-two major marks and the eighty minor ones : who are the mine of excellencies such as the ten powers and the ( four forms of ) indubitable confidence ; who are without perishable flesh and bones ; who are like an image in a mirror ; who because of presentational immediacy, are "body of the joy principle" ( *sambhogavigraha* ) which is spotless, because the notions of truth and error have vanished ; who are not separable and different from the uncreated "body of the true nature of things" ( *dharmakāya* ) which is all the Buddhas and from the "body of re-presentation and imagery" ( *nirmāṇakāya* ), because they are that "basic body" ( *svābhāvikakāya* ) which is the single and unique essence of the three ( former ) bodies ; who are the Skandhas materiality, feeling, sensation, motivity—are but ( so many aspects of congealed ) energy (*vijñānamātratā* ), they are marked by Akṣobhya. And in order to show that energy itself is not a something and that (ultimate reality) is the undivided and indivisible whole (symbolized by the oneness) of the Void (*śūnyatā*) and Compassion (*karuṇā*), Akṣobhya too is marked by Vajrasattva. Thereby it has been established that the universe is the single and unique oneness of existence and Nirvāṇa which (we have split up by our methods of observation into) cause and effect. Moreover, (it has been said in the Ḍākinīvajrapañjara) :

---

[1] Advayavajra, Pañcatathāgatamudrâvivaraṇam, p. 23.
*asaṁskṛtatathâgatâtmakadharmakâya-kalpitanirmâṇakâyâvibhinnâ.*
The *na* before *satyâsatyâdisaṁkalpanâpagama* must be omitted. It probably was inserted in reminiscence of p. 40 : *na satyaṁ na mṛṣâ.*

> When the spirit (*cittaṁ*) that is not different from the Void and Compassion together is realized, then the teaching of the Buddha, the Dharma, and the Sangha (is understood).

> In the same way as sweetness is the nature of sugar and heat that of fire, so also the Void is the nature of all phenomena.

Furthermore, it has been stated that

> The thorough knowledge of existence is Nirvāṇa. Thus it has been said".[1])

It is true, the majestity of the universe cannot be envisaged by earth-bound and sense-imprisoned man. For whenever he attempts to penetrate and spy on the "real" objective world, he changes and distorts its workings by the very process of observation. He is somewhat in the position of a blind man trying to discern the shape and texture of a snow-flake. As soon as it touches his fingers it dissolves. Indeed, we may even say that his "real" objective world is like a magic forest, whose countless trees unceasingly change their places and shapes. But in trying to bring to light his true nature, his potentialities, and the way to actualize them, he may first of all realize that all the techniques he has developed only abstract from man or the universe what is attainable by their special methods and that, after all, they are but glasses coloured by doctrines, beliefs, and illusions. Then, when he learns that his familiar duality of body and mind are but views taken of the same object by different methods and that, in the same way as his body partakes of the material world with its chemical and other properties, so also his mind stretches beyond the narrow boundaries of his ego, he will see that his individual duality is only one aspect of a deeper and more remarkable duality which pervades all nature. And when he understands that the duality of physical universe and cosmic mind are, like his own individual duality of body and mind, but different views taken from the same single reality, he will no longer ask which aspect is really true, because now he knows that the whole cannot be split up into parts which by themselves would suffice to "explain" or describe reality.

---

[1] Advayavajra, Pañcākāra, p. 42. The text, being rather corrupt, has been corrected by me; The correct version is *asaṁskṛtātathāgatātmaka-dharmakāyakalpitanirmāṇakāyāvyabkinnā*...,

Now, I am fully aware of the danger in mechanistic utterance which tends to create myths (also scientific ones!) and illusions by understatement and to make us either materialists or idealists of various shades. By insisting, however, accurately, that the universe including man is nothing but congealed energy, it makes it seem less complicated and awe-inspiring than it is, thereby quite literally creating an illusion. Unlike Western philosophical and religious utterances, Buddhism in telling men about the peaks of human experience never neglects the values of the plain. In emphasizing the emotional significance of certain aspects of life by the punctuation of spirit, it does not distract attention from the implicit spirituality of the commonplace. Thus, Saraha exclaims

> "Do not give yourself up to the Void, consider the "here" and the "there" as equal. Even if it be but the awn of sesame, it will inevitably give you the pain of a pin-prick".[1]

Only when we are aware of the fact that any translation of Buddhist symbols in European languages will remain an understatement, because it cannot convey the feeling-emotional tone to us, and that more is implied than what the most highly developed language of modern physics can express, we may try to render Advayavajra's words into a Western language:

> "Because the five components (of our terrestrial existence) which have been created by our own methods of observation (*Pratītyasamutpanna*) are by nature the five Tathāgatas (energy), and because the nature (of these five) is the non-separateness of the Void and Compassion (*śūnyatākaruṇābhinnatvāt*), it is an established fact that the (whole) universe is the non-separateness of the Void and Compassion (*śūnyatākaruṇābhinnaṁ*)".[2]

This non-separateness is enlightenment, as has already been pointed out in the Guhyasamājatantra:

> "Without beginning and end, peaceful, not deficient (because either) being or non-being (is attributed to it), all-pervading and ever-present, non-separateness of

---

[1] Saraha 77:

*suṇṇahi sanga ma karahi tuhu jahī tahī sama cintassa*
*tila-tusa-matta bi salatta beaṇu karaï abassa*

[2] Advayavajra, Pañcatathâgatamudrâvivaraṇam. p. 26: *tasmât pañcâkârâṇâṁ pratītyasamutpannānâṁ pañcatathāgatasvabhâvatvât svabhâvasya ca śūnyatākaruṇābhinnatvāt śūnyatākaruṇābinnaṁ jagad iti sthitam.*

the Void and Compassion—this is called Enlightenment".[1]

And similarly Advayavajra states that

"That which is the non-separateness of the Void and Compassion is enlightenment-knowledge".[2]

Indrabhūti, commenting upon the passage from the Guhyasamājatantra, declares that

"Without beginning and end' means that it is without origin and annihilation. By this term it has been established that it is all-pervading, unchangeable, and extending through all aspects of time. For that which is coarse matter and localized in a definite place, changing, and passing through time, is annihilated. But also that which is localized in subtle matter is annihilated. For example, the fragrance of musk and similar substances, though it is subtle but localized in a definite place, perishes and changes, when musk and those substances perfumed by it do no longer exist. 'Peaceful' means that it is peaceful from the very beginning, because all the defilements (of mind) are accidental (i.e. only on the reel of one's consciousness they seem to "happen"). 'Not deficient (because either) being or non-being (is attributed to it)' is said, because it is endowed with the afore-mentioned qualities. 'All-pervading and ever-present' means that it is ever-sublime, the Lord, because it accomplishes the works to be done by and fulfills all the needs of all beings, be these works and needs worldly or super-worldly. 'Non-separateness of the Void and Compassion' means (original) mind in which the Void, which is "perspected"

---

1. Guhyasamâjatantra, p. 153:
*anādinidhanaṃ śāntam bhāvābhāvâkṣayaṃ vibhuṃ*
*śūnyatâkaruṇâbhinnam bodhicittam iti smṛtam*

2. Advayavajra, Mahâyânaviṁśikâ 16 cd:
*śūnyatàkaruṇâbhinnaṃ yad bodhau jñânam iṣyate*

knowledge of the All-Buddha-knowledge, because (it has been realized that) all things are not a something, is not separate from Compassion. Compassion is the firm resolve to bring all the beings into this state of King of Knowledge and to vest them with extraordinary bliss. It has been said that

> The Yogin who knows the true nature of all things, together with all the Tathāgatas for ever accomplishes and fulfills the duties of the Buddhas, because he and they are pervading each other. Enlightenment which is accompanied by infinite Great Compassion toward all beings is the Vajra".[1]

For most of us it will be exceedingly difficult to understand this oneness of the Void and Compassion. Our ideas are not only deficient in relevance generally, because we tend to think in terms of such rigid categories that the relationship between things escapes us, but also fail to provide an emotional as well as intellectual understanding of the oneness of man and the universe. Our idolatrous worship of the techniques of science divorced from any ethical goal and the lacunæ in our sense of human dignity make us constantly forget that a given scientific advance raises more problems than it solves. In spite of these drawbacks, which we somehow hope to get around, we concentrate more and more upon science and neglect to develop the other aspects of our social, cultural, and personal emotional life. Science has not enabled us to grow, it has given us gigantism. And yet we cannot survive without science, or even with less science. We need science to save us from the effects of science. We must bring ourselves to admit that mere theorization greatly hampers progress, which can only be made the hard way, by including ourselves and our difficulties. To suppress one's feelings, emotions, and sympathetic participation in one's object may be feasible and correct when one is dealing with dead matter—whatever this may—but, when one is dealing with the life of man, it can hardly apply. Our physicists are discovering mathematically the unity of the cosmos which the Buddhist sages long since discovered mystically. The discoveries of the modern physicists will enable us to understand the Tāntric teachings to a certain extent but they will not exempt us from the task of developing a sense of citizenship in nature—a social conscience, one might say, which is inherent in the Buddhist teachings. The trouble is that we in the modern West believe that we can dispense with man and that it will suffice to direct our propaganda at minds which only need convincing by logical arguments, evening classes, pamphlets and so on, to recognize their own interests and to act accordingly. We believe that we can order enlightenment by mail and have it come wrapped in cellophane. But, direct, personal action, rather than mere participation in and support of any campaign is one of the keynotes of Buddhist teachings. Help all you can on the big things of life but do some little thing yourself. In this way, by putting our ideals into the furnace instead of believing that our ideals are of much nobler alloy than those of others, we will achieve social integration as well as personal integration, which is the key to inner peace and outer effectiveness. To every kind of fruitfulness. Compassion, which is so important in Buddhism, is not some sort of passionate pity which moves man to do all kinds of good and beautiful things but, just because it is a mere visceral disturbance, warps man's judgement, causes him to make all kinds of ludicrous and harmful mistakes, and translates itself into the most absurdly sentimental view of life. Compassion in Buddhism is inseparably connected with Wisdom. That means when we have gained insight into the fundamental significance of life and of the universe and when we cease from worrying about merely individual interests, Compassion is free to work its own way; unobstructed by selfish encumbrances it is able to spread through the whole universe. This emotional richness must be taken into account if ever we want to understand the Tāntric teachings, which are highly scientific, though they cannot be described in, or grasped by our emotionally poor scientific concepts.

---

[1] Jñānasiddhi XV, 5 sq.

The unity of the cosmos, which the modern physicists have discovered mathematically and the Buddhist sages mystically, as I here pointed out before, is most clearly expressed in the following verse :

"That which is Compassion and the Void (by nature) is Time (*kāla*), and the Void which in conventional shape is perceived through the screen of man's senses is the Wheel (*cakra*). (The combination of these two,) Kālacakra, is non-duality, imperishable.")[1]

Nāropa, commenting on this verse, is more explicit. He says :

"He (the Ādibuddha, the Sahajakāya), indeed, is the Kālacakra, the Exalted One, who is both wisdom and means (*prajñopāyātmaka*), because cognition and the cognizable blend in his oneness. And since this awareness (of oneness) which is imperishable bliss, is the reason for the fact that all obscurations (of the mind) disappear, it is called Time (*kāla*). The term means (*upāya*) signifies

---

[1] Sekoddeśaṭīkā, p. 8.

Compassion (*karuṇa*) together with the six spiritual powers. The universe as the cognizable is the Wheel (*cakra*). The term wheel signifies the endless forms of existence within the three spheres of the world. This, indeed, is wisdom (*prajñā*), being the Void by nature and endowed with all the aspects (which the universe presents to the observer). Their unity is called the KALACHAKRA"[1]

Here it has been stated most clearly that reality exists both in time and in space and that the two are indivisible. It must not be thought, however, that this space-time continuum is simply a mathematical or philosophical construction. The universe is a space-time continuum. Only in our minds we tend to separate the three dimensions of space and the one of time. We have an awareness of space and an awareness of time. But this separation is purely subjective. As a matter of fact, modern physics has shown that the time dimension can no more be detached from the space dimension than length can be detached from breadth and thickness in an accurate representation of a house, a tree, or Mr. X. Space has no objective reality except as an order or arrangement of the things we perceive in it, and time has no independent existence from the order of events by which we measure it. All measurements of time are really measurements in space, and conversely all measurements in space depend on measurements of time. Thus, seconds, minutes, hours, days, weeks, months, years, are measurements of the earth's position in space relative to the sun, the moon, and the stars. Similarly, latitude and longitude, the terms by which man defines his spatial position on earth or on the ocean, are measured in minutes and seconds, and in order to compute them accurately we must know the time of the day and the day of the year. Since time is, speaking the language of modern physics, an impalpable quantity it is not possible to draw a picture or to construct a model of the world or of man as a four-dimensional space-time continuum. But it can be imagined. And it can be represented symbolically. Here it is necessary to introduce an important fact. Since man stretches beyond the frontiers of his skin and beyond the self-imposed limits of his consciousness he is not a model of the universe itself. He is not a copy of something, but he is everything, This feeling and awareness of being the whole is of the utmost social value. It hardly requires much demonstration to show that a mind free from delusion—the worst delusion being the copy idea and hence the separateness from the whole—has a quieting and liberating effect upon all minds that are exposed to its influence, while the deluded mind engenders and even aggravates delusions in others. Therefore, any victory over delusion in a single mind, any realization of being the whole, is a blow struck at the accumulation of mass delusions. Any thought, action, or feeling which raises the sense of dignity of those who are striving to attain this being-the-whole is a step toward its attainment. The distinction between subject and object tends to dissolve if we look at man and the world in this way, as do the qualms of the soul which stem from its dividedness and separateness.

---

[1] Sekoddeśaṭīkâ, p. 8.

Clearly, in his brief tenancy on earth man egocentrically orders events in his mind according to his own feelings of past, present, and future. But except on the reels of his own consciousness the universe does not "happen" it simply exists. However, to say that it exists is an oversimplification, an under-statement, a myth. The statement that the universe or man is the Ādibuddha is but an inadequate verbalization of an all-comprehensive experience. The Ādibuddha is assuredly not a God who plays dice with the world in order to pass away his time. He is not a sort of monotheism either, superimposed on an earlier, allegedly atheistic Buddhism. Such notions are the errors of professional semanticists. Buddhism has no taste for theorization. It constantly aims at stripping off all such artificial wrappings as have been devised by humanity for its own solemnization and aggrandizement. It attempts to delve into the secret depths of our inmost being and to make the hidden light shine forth brilliantly. Therefore, the Adibuddha is best translated as the unfolding of man's true nature. Its explanation by Nāropa runs as follows,

"The term Ādi means without beginning and end; the term Buddha means that one has awakened to the fact that all the phenomena (we encounter in life) are not opposing each other (i.e. the conflict going on in the world of our self-imposed limitations has been resolved). Both terms together form the verbal expression Ādibuddha. The meaning is that he (the Ādibuddha or he who has realized his own true nature) is without origin and end, that he is all-knowing. In the Nāmasaṅgīti it has also been stated that

> The Buddha who is without beginning and end is the Ādibuddha. He is not dependent upon the logical sequence of ideas'.[1]

The fact that man is the Buddha by nature has often been reiterated in the Buddhist texts. "Every being is potentially a Tathāgata and has this (liberating) knowledge".[2] There is no difference between man and man essentially, nor between man and the universe. Everything is a manifestation or, perhaps stated more exactly, a symbol for ultimate reality. The difference between the beings is only caused by a greater or lesser power to manifest that which is in all of us and that which we all are in reality. The inseparability of man from the universe creates the feeling of universal participation which, in turn, raises our sense of our own dignity and, at the same time, begets reverence. Reverence, which must not be confused with servility, is the deeply religious feeling not to slight others. It is utmost sincerity of the heart, a mind free from illusions, among which the master illusion is the superstition that our ego is more important than another and that we can be free when we have turned others to cinders in their beds or rubbed the salt of reproof into the wounds of someone else's error. The Buddhahood of man is not a sentimental blab. It is totality felt by the whole. It is the bright light by which one sees.

---

[1] Sekoddeśaṭīkâ, p. 7.

[2] Sekoddeśaṭīkâ, p. 64:
*uktaṁ ca tathâgatajñānagarbhāḥ sarvasattvâ iti.*
See also Laṅkāvatârasūtra, p. 77.

> "Do not make any difference between the ego and the non-ego. Everything is the Buddha. This is the most sublime and spotless place. The mind is pure by its own nature".[1]

This, then, is the Tāntric view of life. When we consciously try to develop our own potential and when the difficult is achieved, darkness overcome lights the flame of reality, pushing back the darkness that still remains until everything has become light. The light enlightening the whole universe.

---

[1] Saraha 108 :

*para appâṇa ma bhatti karu saala nirantara Buddha*
*ehu so nimmala param paü citta sahâbē suddha.*

# INDEX OF SANSKRIT, PĀLI, AND PRĀKRIT WORDS.

akṛtrima 89
akṣara 93, 113, 133, 139, 144, 146
akṣaraṃ jñānaṃ 146
acyuta 140
anāhataṃ tattvaṃ 93
animittavimokṣa 135
apratiṣṭhitanirvāṇa 169
apratiṣṭhitamānasa 117
ab 155
amanasikāra 117
avijjā 19
avidyā 19, 99, 111, 151
asthānayoga 30
ākāśa 155
ātmaiva 49
ādarśajñāna 173
ānanda 87 sq., 95
ālayavijñāna 7, 10
āvaraṇa 125
upānayati 155
upāya 28, 49, 145, 154, 156, 158 sq., 184
upāyabhāga 146
ekakṣaṇābhisambodhi 7
ekku karu baṇṇa 37
evaṃ 87 sq.
ka 133
karuṇā 133, 158, 178
karman 87
karmamudrā 87, 90
karmavāsanā 9
kalpanāsvarūpa 87
kāmataṇhā 21
kāmadhātu 85
kāya 7, 12, 119
kāraṇa 139
kāla 184
kṛtyānusthānajñāna 173
kṛpā 122, 159
kodravya 90
kleśajñeyāvṛta 173
kṣaṇikanāmāparasahajākhya 91
kṣarasukha 85
grāhakacitta 113
grāhyacitta 113
grāhyādarśabhāsa 113
cakra 184
citta 178
cittavajra 135
jinālaya 46
jñāna 113
jñānavajra 133
jñānavijñāna 176
taṇhakkhaya 20
taṇhā 19, 20
taṇhādutiya 20

tattvayoga 106
tathatā 128
tṛṣṇā 19, 20
tejas 155
duḥkha 18
dharmakāya 121, 136, 177
dharmamudrā 87, 90
dhātu 156
dhāraṇa 113
dhyāna 113
na dharmapratiṣṭhita 118
nimitta 135
nirālamba 117
nirmāṇakāya 177
nirvastuka 60
nirvāṇa 50, 140
nirvikalpavidhisthita 48
niṣyandavāsanā 9
nispandaphala 89, 91
niḥsvabhāva 116, 138
niḥsvabhāvatā 159
pañcākārābhisambodhi 7
padmabhāṇḍa 46
paramākṣarasukhajñāna 124
paramānanda 88, 95
paramārtha 72
paramārthasatya 27, 121, 142, 144
pūrvānubhukta 101
pṛthivī 155
pṛthivyādicaturdhātuvāsanābheda 8
prajñā 28, 50 sq., 73, 113, 145, 154, 156, 158
prajñājñāna 89, 96, 146
prajñāpāramitā, 72
prajñābhāga 146
prajñopāya 154, 159
prajñopāyātmaka 134, 184
prajñopāyātmako dharmātmā yoga 136
prajñopāyātmyakaṃ tattvaṃ 29
pratītyasamutpanna 180
pratyaya 101
pratyayakāriṇī 85
pratyavekṣaṇajñāna 173
pratyāhāra 113
prāṇāyāma 113
prauḍha 113
phala 139
bandha 29
bāla 113
bāhyārthasambhava 72
bindu 7, 10, 93
bimba 139 sq., 145
bīja 8
bodhi 1, 50
bodhicitta 1, 46, 48 sq., 140
bodhicittasamanvita 48
bodhicittasvarūpa 49
bolakakkola 91
bhagavatī prajñā 73
bhagavān vajrī 49
bhava 24
bhavataṇhā 21
bhavasya niḥsaraṇaṃ 24
bhave tṛṣṇā 24

majjana 113
manasikāra 117
mahākaruṇā 49
mahāmudrā 87, 90
mahārāa 37
mahāsukha 16, 86 sq.
mahāsukhakāya 119
mahāsukhaikarūpa 116
māyājālābhisambodhi 8
mithyāgurujana 168
mudaṃ 85
mudrā 45, 46, 85
mudryate 116
maitryātmaka 135
mokṣa 29, 30
moha 165
yuganaddha 125, 146
yuganaddhakāya 121
yuganaddhatā 122
yuganaddhākhya 121
rañjati 49, 159
rati 85, 124
rasa 125
rāga 49, 159
ruṇaddhi 133
rūpa 155, 165, 175
rūpataṇhā 21
rūpadhātusukhasya hetujñānaṃ 101
rohita 7
lalanārūpam āsthāya 72
vajra 46, 48, 49
vajradhāriṇī 48
vajrasattva 45
vajrāveśanapravartana 45
vāyu 155
vāsanā 7, 8, 125, 170
viṃśatyākārābhisambodhi 8
vicitra 88, 95
vijñāna 155, 165 sq., 175, 177
vijñānamātratā 177
vipāka 88, 95
vibhava 24
vibhavataṇhā 22
vibhave tṛṣṇā 24
vimarda 88, 95
viramānanda 88, 96
vilakṣaṇa 88, 89
viśuddha 134
viśvamātādidevīsvabhāva 101
vedanā 155, 175
śaktirūpeṇa 125
śukra 139
śūnyatā 51, 112, 114, 126, 133, 139, 158, 165, 167, 176, 177 sq.
śūnyatākaruṇā 140
śūnyatākaruṇābhinna(tva) 180
śūnyatāvimokṣa 133
śūnyatābodhi 167
saṃvṛti 72
samvṛtibodhicittaṃ manyantargataṃ 91 (instead of samvṛti-savta-spanda)
saṃvṛtisatya 27, 121, 142, 144

saṃsāra 140
saṃskārāḥ 155, 175
saṃjñā 155, 175
sadguru 29
samatājñāna 173
samantabhadrā 173
samayamudrā 87
samarasa 33
samarasībhūta 7
sambhogavigraha 177
saroruha 91
sahaja 89, 113
sahajanispanda 91
sahajavilakṣaṇayor ante 89
sahajasiddha 29
sahajānanda 88
sākṣātkaraṇa 125
sākṣātkāra 125
sādhaka 106
sukha 12, 16, 139
sukhita 29
suviśuddhajñāna 173
skandha 156
spanda 113
spandasukha 101
svacittaparikalpita 101
svaccham āsthānaṃ 91
svābhāvikakāya 177
hetu 85, 135, 139

## INDEX OF SUBJECTS.

Absolute truth 67
action 28
activity 50, 53, 145, 146, 156
Ādibuddha 184
adient drive *22*
ambieroticism 1
anabolic-katabolic 30, 34
anabolism 10
attitude 24 sq.
authentication 147
avoidance *22*
avoidant drive 22
Belief 23
bisexual 31
bisexuality 1, 2, et passim
bliss 12, 17, 139, see also *sukha* and *mahāsukha*
body and mind 163, 179
body and soul 6, 7, 55
body schema 12
Buddhism 52
Cell 30, 34
Christianity 78, 52
Christian Fathers 66
Compassion 116, 122, 133, 178, 182 sq., see also Great Compassion
completeness 137
consciousness 36, 55, 59, 70 sq., 74, 83, 96, 165 sq.
contraries 36, 43 sq., 59, 69
conventional truth 27, see also symbolic truth, literal truth
cult of the soul 62, 68
cycle of activity 15, 17, 23
Delusion 77, et passim
delusion of grandeur 77
delusion of presecution 77
depth-psychology 12 sq., 170 sq.,
Dharmakāya 121, 125
Dharmamudrā 90
Dhātu 159 sq., 165, 172
Dhyānibuddha 161, 163, 165, 168 sq., 172 sq.
Divine Mother 101, 108
Divine Wisdom 73
dogmaticism 99
drive 19, 24, 26, 73
Ego 40, 58, 73, 78, 97 sq., 139, 165
endocrine glands 3
energy 9, 18, 33, 148, 175
enlightenment 1, 15, 17, 53, et passim
extraject 47, 56, 65, see also projection
extrajected 85
Fanaticism 99

feelings and emotions 15
God 9 sq., 79, 98
gods and goddesses 75
goddess 99 sq.
Great Bliss 86, 87, 116, 119, 133
Great Compassion 53, 140
Great Mudrā 117, 119, 120, 124, 145
Habit 23
heredity 8
Holy Virgin 77 sq.
Ignorance 19, 51, 99, 111, 136, see also *avidyā*
imagination 58, 70, 71, 76
imputation 38, 56
incestuous character 106 sq.
inseparability of masculinity and femininity 12, et passim
instinctivity 33
integration 36, 53, 54, 57, 80, 105, 108
intellect 127, 129
intellectual knowledge 142, see also symbolic knowledge
internal environment 8
involution 63
Jñānamudrā 100 sq., 105 sq., 110, 116, 145, 163
joy-principle 75
Kālacakra 184
Karmamudrā 84 sq., 89, 95, 103, 110, 115 sq., 145, 163
katabolism 10
Lack of spirituality 57
liberation 23, 123, et passim
literal knowledge 142, 144, see also intellectual knowledge, symbolic knowledge
literal truth 121, see also conventional truth, symbolic truth
Mahāmudrā 108, 116 sq., 131
Māra 66
masculinity and femininity 5, 7, 43, et passim
mass 149, see also energy
mass and energy 175
matter 149
matter and mind 35, 45, 164
matter and spirit 101, 125, 133
meaning 50
mind 118, see also matter, spirit
moment 88, 95
morality 129
mother 108, see also Divine Mother
Nirmāṇakāya 176
normality 1, 61
Objectivation 38
original mind 111, 181
Partial consciousness 11, see also consciousness, ego
perseverance 21
Phalamudrā 124 sq., 131

pleasure-principle 75
poetry 99 sq.
Prajñā 154, 155
Prajñopāya 154
projection 85, 94, see also extraject
quantitative 56
qualitative 58
Reality 143
rebirth 18
Sahaja 131 sq., 134, 141, 144 sq.
śakti 161, 163, 165, 168, 172 sq.
Samādhi 141, 143
Sambhogakāya 176
Satan 79
science 81 sq., 119, 182
sense of rightness 54, 65, 129
sex drive 84, 85, 86
sexuality 44, 47
sexualization 96
sign 14, see also symbol
sin and virtue 129 sq.
Skandha 159 sq., 165, 172
soul 54, 132
spirit 26, see also matter, mind
spirituality 26, 33, 126
spiritualization 46, 74
symbol 13 sq., 32, 81 sq., 94, 109, 122, 154
symbolic knowledge 142 sq., see also literal knowledge, intellectual knowledge
symbolic truth 27, 121, see also literal truth, conventional truth
Total truth 120, see also absolute truth
transcendental knowledge 144
truth 67
Unconscious 36, 55, 59, 97, 110
unitive knowledge 30
unity of opposites 121
Upāya 154, 155
Void see *śūnyatā*
Wisdom 28, 50, 111, 145, 156, 184
wisdom-perfection 72
witch 77, 79

## CORRECTIONS.

p. 4, 1. 31 read : femininity instead of : emininity

p. 8, 1, 8 „ : (*māyājālavad anantabhāvasaṃvittir*), then there is comprehension oft he ascriptions (*māyājālābhisambodhi*).

p. 13, 1. 23 „ : or of a reorganization instead of : of a reorganization

p. 20, I. 13 „ : Eleusine „ : Bleusine

p. 30, 1. 8 „ : inflicted „ : inflicated

p. 66, lines 19 sq. form one paragraph

p. 178, last line of note read : °*vyabhinnā*... „ : °*vyabkinnā*...

## THE CHOWKHAMBA SANSKRIT STUDIES.

Vol. I. ABHINAVAGUPTA. An Historical and Philosophical
Study by Dr. K. C. Pandey, with a Foreword
by Dr. Ganga Nath Jha. Rs. 15-0

Vol. II. INDIAN ÆSTHETICS by Dr. K. C. Pandey,
with a Foreword by S. Radhakrishnan. Rs. 16-0

**The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, Banaras.**